arXiv:0710.2192v1 [math.AP] 11 Oct 2007

Quantitative estimates of unique continuation for parabolic equations, determination of unknown time-varying boundaries and optimal stability estimates

Sergio Vessella*

Abstract

In this paper we will review the main results concerning the issue of stability for the determination unknown boundary portion of a thermic conducting body from Cauchy data for parabolic equations. We give detailed and selfcontained proofs. We prove that such problems are severely ill-posed in the sense that under a priori regularity assumptions on the unknown boundaries, up to any finite order of differentiability, the continuous dependence of unknown boundary from the measured data is, at best, of logarithmic type.

We review the main results concerning quantitative estimates of unique continuation for solutions to second order parabolic equations. We give a detailed proof of a Carleman estimate crucial for the derivation of the stability estimates.

1 Introduction

In this paper we will review the main results concerning the quantitative estimates of unique continuation for solutions to second order parabolic equations (with real coefficients) and the issue of the stability for various type of inverse parabolic problems with unknown boundaries. We want to stress that we are going to be quite sketchy on the applications and the methods of numerical reconstruction of the solution of such problems. Such a choice is due to the wideness of the results on this subject.

Let $\{\Omega(t)\}_{t\in[0,T]}$ be a family of bounded domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$, where T is a given positive number. We shall suppose that the boundary of $\Omega((0,T)) := \bigcup_{t\in(0,T)} \Omega(t)\times\{t\}$ is sufficiently smooth, but for every $t\in(0,T)$ a part $I(t)$ of $\partial\Omega(t)$ is not known. In many applications $\Omega(t)$ represents (at a fixed time t) a thermic conducting body or specimen. The portion $I(t)$ can be, for any

---

*This work was partially supported by MIUR, PRIN, number 2006014115.

$t \in (0,T)$, some interior component of $\partial\Omega(t)$ or some inaccessible portion of the exterior component of $\partial\Omega(t)$. The inverse problems consist in determining $I(t)$, for every $t \in (0,T)$, by means of thermal measurements on the accessible part $A(t) := \partial\Omega(t) \smallsetminus I(t)$. Throughout the paper, for the sake of simplicity, we shall assume that $A(t)$ is not time varying. In order to give a sufficiently general mathematical formulation of the problems, let us consider a boundary linear operator $\mathcal{B}$ on $\bigcup\limits_{t\in[0,T]} \partial\Omega(t) \times \{t\}$ which we shall specify later and let f be a nontrivial function, we consider the following initial-boundary value problem (the direct problem), where we set $I((0,T]) := \bigcup\limits_{t\in(0,T]} I(t) \times \{t\}$.

$$\begin{cases} div\,(\kappa\nabla u) - \partial_t u = 0, & \text{in } \Omega((0,T)), \\ \mathcal{B}u = f, & \text{on } A \times (0,T], \\ \mathcal{B}u = 0, & \text{on } I((0,T]), \\ u(.,0) = u_0, & \text{in } \Omega(0). \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Here $\kappa = \left\{\kappa^{ij}(x,t,u)\right\}_{i,j=1}^{n}$ denotes the known symmetric thermal conductivity tensor which satisfies a hypothesis of uniform ellipticity. The boundary operator $\mathcal{B}$ may be one of the following operators

(a) $\mathcal{B}u = u$ (boundary Dirichlet operator),
(b) $\mathcal{B}u = \kappa\nabla u \cdot \nu$ (boundary Neumann operator),
(c) $\mathcal{B}u = \kappa\nabla u \cdot \nu + b_0 u$, $b_0 \not\equiv 0$ (boundary Robin operator),
where ν denotes the unit exterior normal to $\Omega(t)$.

Given an open portion Σ of $\partial\Omega(t)$ such that $\Sigma \subset A$, we consider the inverse problems of determinig $I(t)$, $t \in (0,T]$, from the knowledge, in case (a) of $\kappa\nabla u \cdot \nu$ on $\Sigma \times [0,T]$ and, in case (b) and (c), from the knowledge of u on $\Sigma \times [0,T]$. We shall refer to the inverse problems introduced above as the *inverse Dirichlet problem,* the *inverse Neumann problem* and the *inverse Robin problem* respectively (for short: *Dirichlet, Neumann* or *Robin* case respectively).

In many applications $I(t)$ represents:

(i) the boundary of a cavity or a corroded part of $\Omega(t)$, [21]- [28], [47], [48], [72], [76], [115], [138], [143]

or

(ii) a privileged isothermal surface, such as a solidification front of $\Omega(t)$, that is not accessible to direct inspection, [13], [19], [20], [39], [55], [71], [117], [129], [131].

The boundary operator $\mathcal{B}$ is, in case (i), either the boundary Neumann operator [12], [25], [83] or the boundary Robin operator [96], [21], [22]. In case (ii), $\mathcal{B}$ is the boundary Dirichlet operator. Most of the problems of (i) arise in thermal imaging. In such problems, and in all the mentioned papers of (i), the unknown boundary is assumed not time varying. Therefore our formulation with time varying boundary seems a mere, although quite natural, mathematical generalization of the original problems. On the contrary, the assumption of time varying boundary, as well as the assumption of dependence of κ on u, seems particularly appropriate for the problems of case (ii).

We want to stress that in the present paper we study in details the stability issue for the Dirichlet case only. The stability issue for problems in the type (i) (Dirichlet and Neumann case) is studied in [140], [36], [37], [53]. The stability issue for problems of type (ii) is studied in [20], [117], [139]. We shall illustrate below extensively the main problems that arise in the stability issue. Actually, concerning the uniqueness and the stability, the Neumann case, when the unknown boundary is not time varying, is treated similarly to the Dirichlet case. In the case of time varying unknown boundaries, uniqueness and stability for the inverse Neumann problem is an open question. It is quite remarkable that uniqueness and stability for the Robin case is an open question even if the unknown boundaries are not time varying. Concerning such a problem we recall the papers [22], [102]. In [102] the uniqueness for such a case has been proved under the (essential) hypotheses that κ depends on x only and the unknown boundary is not time varying. In [22] the uniqueness for the Robin case is proved in dimension two under the assumption that the unknown boundary is a small perturbation of a graph. Concerning the methods of reconstruction of unknown boundaries, we refer to the papers [49], [93], [94], [121], [84]. Here the so-called probe method and enclosure method seem to be effective and promising, at least for parabolic equations with constant coefficients, for a constructive determination of unknown boundaries from boundary measurements. The issue of numerical reconstruction of the unknown boundaries is studied in [21], [22], [24], [25], [27], [28], [42], [43].

The inverse problems studied in the present paper are severely ill-posed in the sense that under a priori smoothness assumptions on the unknown boundaries $I(t)$, $t \in [0,T]$, up to any finite order of differentiability, the continuous dependence of $I(t)$ from the measured data is, at best, of logarithmic type. Such a severely ill-posed character of the above inverse problems has been proved in [53], see also [51], when κ is constant, $u_0 = 0$ and the unknown boundary *is not* time varying , see Section 5.2 for a sketch of the proof. In the present paper, (see Section 5.1), we prove the (severely) ill-posedness when, κ is a constant, $u_0 = 0$ and the unknown boundary *is* time-varying. It is interesting to observe that the severely ill-posed character has been proved, in [53] and Section 5.1, when instead of a single measurement the whole Dirichlet-to-Neumann map is known.

The first results concerning this type of inverse problems have been obtained for elliptic equations, see [12], [62], [63], [82], [83], [95], [96], [97], [134], [138], [143]. We will describe first the main steps of the proofs of stability and unique continuation in this case because many of these can be extended to the parabolic case. The mathematical formulation of the inverse elliptic problem is the following one. Let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with a sufficiently smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ a part of which I is unknown. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a boundary linear operator on $\partial\Omega$ and let f be a nontrivial function. Let u be the solution to the following boundary value problem.

$$\begin{cases} div\,(\sigma\nabla u) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathcal{B}u = f, & \text{on } A, \\ \mathcal{B}u = 0, & \text{on } I, \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

(with a possible normalization condition, such as $\int_\Omega u = 0$, if $\mathcal{B}$ is the boundary Neumann operator). Here σ denotes the known electrical conductivity (symmetric) tensor satisfying a hypothesis of uniform ellipticity. Given an open portion Σ of $\partial\Omega$ such that $\Sigma \subset A$ we are interested in determining I from the knowledge of $\kappa\nabla u \cdot \nu$ on Σ, in the Dirichlet case, and from the knowledge of u on Σ, in the Neumann and in the Robin case. The first stability results for the just mentioned problems (in the Dirichlet and Neumann case) have been proved, when σ is the identity matrix, in [18] for $n = 2$ and in [40], [30], [31] for $n = 3$. In the last three papers the unknown boundary is a graph. In all the cited papers the stability results, proved under a priori regularity assumption on I up to a finite order of differentiability, are of logarithmic type. Such a type of stability is optimal, [3], [52]. Logarithmic stability estimates for $n = 2$, when σ is inhomogeneous, discontinuous and under relaxed a priori assumption on I, have been proved in [4], [130] and, for $n \geq 3$, in [5] (see also [6]). In [17] a Lipschitz stability estimate has been proved (in Dirichlet case) under the a priori assumption that I is a polygonal line, σ is homogeneous, $n = 2$.

In the above mentioned papers [18], [40], [30], [31], [4], [130] the proof of stability results is based on arguments related to complex analytic methods which do not carry over the case $n \geq 3$. In [5], where the case $n \geq 3$ is studied, the proof of the results is based on some quantitative versions of strong unique continuation properties of solutions to elliptic equations. The methods in [5] has been used to prove stability for many inverse problems (not only for second order ellipic equations [119], [120]) with unknown boundaries. In particular, for the parabolic inverse problems with unknown boundaries, such arguments have been used in Section 4 of the present paper for the case of time-varying boundaries and in papers [36], [37], [53] for the case of not time varying boundaries. In [36], [37] κ depends on x only, in [53] κ depends on x ad t.

The strong unique continuation property in the *interior* for elliptic equations asserts that if u is a solution to $div\,(\sigma\nabla u) = 0$, in Ω, and u doesn't vanish in Ω then, for every $x_0 \in \Omega$, there exist $C > 0$ and $K \geq 0$ such that for every r sufficiently small we have

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} u^2 dx \geq Cr^K. \tag{1.3}$$

Likewise, the strong unique continuation property at the *boundary* asserts that given a solution u to the equation $div\,(\sigma\nabla u) = 0$, in Ω, and, for instance, $u = 0$ on $I \subset \partial\Omega$, such that u doesn't vanish identically in Ω then, for very $x_0 \in I$, there exists $C > 0$ and $K \geq 0$ such that, for any sufficiently small r we have

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)\cap\Omega} u^2 dx \geq Cr^K. \tag{1.4}$$

We emphasize that in (1.3) and (1.4) the quantities C and K may depend on u, but they do not depend on r. In other words, (1.3) and (1.4) tell us that if u doesn't vanish in Ω then it cannot have a zero of infinite order in a point of $\Omega \cup I$.

The interior strong unique continuation property for second order elliptic equations is known since 1956 by Aronzajn and Cordes papers, [14], [45], and since 1963, with optimal assumption regarding the regularity of σ, by N. Aronszajn, A. Krzywicki and J. Szarski paper [15]. Two suitable quantitative versions of the strong unique continuation property in *the interior* are the three sphere inequality, [91], [106], [107] and the doubling inequality [67]. The strong unique continuation properties at *the boundary* for second order elliptic equations has been studied in the 90's by Adolfsson, Escauriaza, Kenig, Kukavica and Wang, [1], [2], [86], [92].

Now we sketch a crucial and significant step of the proof of [5] when $\mathcal{B}$ in (1.2) is the boundary Dirichlet operator. Let Ω_1, Ω_2 be two domains with sufficiently smooth boundaries. For the sake of simplicity let us assume that Ω_1, Ω_2 are two convex domains and $|\Omega_i| \leq 1$, $i = 1, 2$, where $|\Omega_i|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of Ω_i. Assume $\partial\Omega_i = A \cup I_i$, $\text{Int}_{\partial\Omega}(I_i) \cap \text{Int}_{\partial\Omega}(A) = \varnothing$, $I_i \cap A = \partial A = \partial I_i$ $i = 1, 2$. Let u_i be the solution to (1.2) when $\Omega = \Omega_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Assume that $\|\sigma\nabla u_1 \cdot \nu - \sigma\nabla u_2 \cdot \nu\|_{L^2(\Sigma\times(0,T))} \leq \varepsilon$.
By standard estimates for the Cauchy problem and propagation smallness estimates we have

$$\|u_1 - u_2\|_{L^\infty(G)} \leq \eta(\varepsilon), \tag{1.5}$$

where $G = \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2$ such that $\Sigma \subset \overline{G}$ and $\eta(\varepsilon)$ is an infinitesimal function as ε tend to 0, $\eta(\varepsilon)$ depends on $\|f\|_{H^{1/2}(A)}$ and on the a priori information on Ω_i, $i = 1, 2$. By the maximum principle and (1.5) we have

$$\|u_i\|_{L^2(\Omega_i\setminus G)} \leq \eta(\varepsilon), \ i = 1, 2. \tag{1.6}$$

Let d be the Hausdorff distance between Ω_1 and Ω_2. Without any restriction we may assume that there exists $x_0 \in I_1$ such that $d = dist(x_0, \Omega_2)$. Now, by (1.6) and by using a quantitative version of (1.4) we get

$$d \leq \left(\frac{\eta(\varepsilon)}{C}\right)^{1/K}. \tag{1.7}$$

Finally, the quantities C and K which appear in inequality (1.7) can be estimated respectively from below and from above in terms of the quantity $\frac{\|f\|_{H^{1/2}(A)}}{\|f\|_{L^2(A)}}$.

In the sequel of the introduction we shall outline the main steps to derive some quantitative estimates of unique continuation for parabolic equations useful to prove stability results for inverse parabolic problems with unknown boundaries.

Such estimates can be divided in two large classes:
(i) Stability estimates for noncharacteristic Cauchy problems and quantitative versions of weak unique continuation properties for solutions to parabolic equations;
(ii) Quantitative versions of strong unique continuation properties at the interior and at the boundary, for solutions to parabolic equations.

To make clear the exposition we introduce some notation. First we assume that the leading coefficients of equations does not depend on u, to emphasize such a condition we replace, in the parabolic operator of (1.1), the matrix κ by a and we assume that a depends on x and t only, a is a real symmetric matrix and satisfies a uniform ellipticity condition. We denote by b and c two measurable functions from $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with value in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbb{R}$ respectively. We assume that b and c are bounded. We denote by L the parabolic operator

$$Lu = div\left(a\left(x,t\right)\nabla u\right) - \partial_t u + b\left(x,t\right)\cdot\nabla u + c\left(x,t\right)u.$$

Let D be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let Γ be a sufficiently smooth portion of the boundary ∂D. Let g_1, g_2 be given functions defined on $\Gamma \times (0,T)$. As above, T is a positive number. The *noncharacteristic Cauchy problem* for $Lu = 0$ can be formulated as follows. Determine u such that

$$\begin{cases} Lu = 0, \text{ in } D\times\left(0,T\right), \\ u = g_1, \text{ on } \Gamma\times\left(0,T\right), \\ a\nabla u\cdot\nu = g_2, \text{ on } \Gamma\times\left(0,T\right), \end{cases} \tag{1.8}$$

where ν is the exterior unit normal to D.
We say that the Cauchy problem (1.8) enjoies the uniqueness property if u vanishes whenever g_1, g_2 do. It is well known, [73], [109], [127], that the noncharacteristic Cauchy problem is a severely ill posed problem, as a small error on the data g_1, g_2 may have uncontrollable effects on the solution u of (1.8). Therefore it is very important for the applications to have a *stability estimate* for the solutions of (1.8) whenever such solutions belong to a certain class of functions. There exists a very large literature, for parabolic and other types of equations, on the issue of stability, we refer to the books [99] and [109] for a first introduction on the subject. The uniqueness for the Cauchy problem (1.8) is equivalent to, [122], the so called *weak unique continuation property* for operator L. Such a property asserts that, denoting by ω an open subset of D, if u is a solution to $Lu = 0$ in $D \times (0,T)$ such that $u = 0$ in $\omega \times (0,T)$ then $u = 0$ in $D \times (0,T)$. If Γ is smooth enough, say $C^{1,1}$, then stability estimates for the Cauchy problem (1.8) can be derived by a quantitative version of the above mentioned weak unique continuation property, see Section 3.5 of the present paper for details. In turns, such a weak unique continuation property, is a consequence of (but not equivalent to) the following *spacelike strong unique continuation property* [8] for the operator L. Such a property asserts that, if u is a solution to $Lu = 0$ in $D \times (0,T)$, $t_0 \in (0,T)$ and $u\left(.,t_0\right)$ doesn't vanish identically in D then, for every $x_0 \in D$, there exist $C > 0$ and $K \geq 0$ such that for every r, $0 < r < dist\left(x_0, \partial D\right)$, we have

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} u^2\left(x,t_0\right)dx \geq Cr^K. \tag{1.9}$$

In other words, if the the operator L enjoies such a spacelike strong unique continuation property then $u\left(.,t_0\right)$ either vanishes in D or it cannot have a zero of infinite order in a point of D. We emphasize that in (1.9), C and K may depend on u. The natural quantitative versions of spacelike strong unique continuation property are the doubling inequality for $u(.,t_0)$, [60], and the two-sphere one-cylinder inequality. In a rough form the latter (of which we make an extensive use in this paper) has the following form

$$\|u(.,t_0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho(x_0))} \leq C\,\|u(.,t_0)\|^{\theta}_{L^2(B_r(x_0))}\,\|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(B_R(x_0)\times(t_0-R^2,t_0))}\,, \qquad (1.10)$$

where $\theta = \left(C\log\frac{R}{Cr}\right)^{-1}$, $0 < r < \rho < R$, the cylinder $B_R(x_0) \times \left(t_0 - R^2, t_0\right)$ is contained in $D \times (0,T)$ and C depends neither on u nor on r. See Theorem 3.3.3 for a precise statement.

Before proceeding, we believe of interest to dwell a bit on the regularity of the leading coefficients of L that guarantees the uniqueness and the stability for solutions to problem (1.8). Indeed, by some examples of Miller [118] and Pliš [124] in the elliptic case, it is clear that the minimal regularity of a with respect to the space variables has to be Lipschitz continuity. On the other hand, if a depends on x and t optimal regularity assumptions (to the author knowledge) are not known. Even the cases $n = 1$ or $n = 2$ present open issues of optimal regularity for a.

Now we attempt to give a view of the literature and of the main results concerning quantitative estimates of unique continuation for parabolic equations. To this aim we collect the contributions on the subject in the following way.

(A) *Pioneering works*,

(B) *The case* $n = 1$,

(C) *Weak unique continuation property and Cauchy problem for* $n > 1$,

(D) *Spacelike strong unique property continuation.*

Concerning (A) and (B) we make no claim of bibliographical completeness. A good source of references on such points is the book [35].

(A) *Pioneering works.* Such works concern mainly the case where L is the heat operator $\partial_t - \Delta$ and those paper that are related to the investigation on the regularity properties of solutions to $\partial_t u - \Delta u = 0$, [68], [77], [128]. In this group of contributions we have to enclose the classical papers and books in which the ill posed character of the Cauchy problem for parabolic equation was investigated for the first time [73], [81], [127].

(B) *The case* $n = 1$. This a special, but neverthless interesting case. Of course much more than in the general case ($n \geq 1$), operational transformation, particular tricks and even resolution formulae are available in the case $n = 1$, [33], [34], [44], [75]. In such a case the regularity assumption, especially concerning the leading coefficient, can be releaxed [74], [105], [90].

(C) *Weak unique continuation property and Cauchy problem for* $n > 1$. The most parts of the papers of this group share the Carleman estimates technique for proving the uniqueness and the stability estimates. The basic idea of such a technique has been introduced in the paper [38] to prove the uniqueness of solution of a Cauchy problem for elliptic systems in two variables with nonanalytic coefficients. Nowadays the general theory of Carleman estimates is presented in several books and papers [66], [78], [79], [98], [99], [101], [87], [109], [133], [136], [144]. In particular in [98] a general theory of Carleman estimates for anisotropic operators (of which L is an example) has been developed. Nirenberg [122] has proved, in a very general context, the uniqueness for the Cauchy problem (and the weak unique continuation property) when the entries of matrix a are constants. It is remarkable that in such a paper Nirenberg has posed the question whether for a solution u of the equation $Lu = 0$ in $D \times (0, T)$, D as above, it is true that $u(., t_0) = 0$ in ω, ω open subset of D, it implies $u(., t_0) = 0$ in D. In other words, the question posed by Nirenberg is whether a weak form of the above mentioned spacelike strong unique continuation holds true. John [81] has proved some stability estimate for the Cauchy problem for the operator L under the same hypotheses of [122]. Lees and Protter, [110], [126], have proved uniqueness for the Cauchy problem, when the entries of the matrix a are assumed twice continuously differentiable. To the author's knowledge a stability estimate of Hölder type for the Cauchy problem for the operator L, under the same hypotheses of [110], [126], was proved for the first time in [11], see also [10]. Many authors have contributed to reduce the regularity assumption on a in order to obtain the weak unique continuation for operator L, among those we recall [66], [132], the above mentioned [98] and the references therein. In the context of a quantitative version of weak unique continuation properties for operator L we mention the so called *three cylinder inequalities.* Roughly speaking these are estimates of type

$$\|u\|_{L^2(B_\rho(x_0)\times(t_0,T-t_0))} \leq C \|u\|^{\gamma}_{L^2(B_r(x_0)\times(0,T))} \|u\|^{1-\gamma}_{L^2(B_R(x_0)\times(0,T))} \tag{1.11}$$

where $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, $0 < r < \rho < R$, $t_0 \in (0, T/2)$, the cylinder $B_R(x_0) \times (0, T)$ is contained in $D \times (0, T)$ and C depend neither on u nor on r, but it may depend on t_0. Such an estimate has been proved in [69], [137] when $a \in C^3$. More recently, [59], [142], the regularity assumption on a (up to Lipschitz continuity with respect to x and t) has been reduced and and (1.11) has been proved with an optimal exponent γ, that is $\gamma = \left(C \log \frac{R}{Cr}\right)^{-1}$. Inequality (1.11) and its version at the boundary has been used in [53] to prove optimal stability estimates for the inverse parabolic problem (Dirichlet case) with unknown boundary in the case of not time-varying boundary.

(D) *Spacelike strong unique property continuation.* Such a property and the inequality (1.10) have been proved for the first time in 1974 by Landis and Oleinik [108] in the case where all the coefficients of operator L do not depend on t. In [108] the authors found out a method, named by the authors "elliptic continuation tecnique", to derive unique continuation properties and their quantitative versions by properties and inequalities which hold true in the elliptic context. They have employed this method also for parabolic equation of order higher than two and for systems. The elliptic continuation technique depends strongly on the time independence of the coefficients of the equation. Some fundamental ideas of such technique can be traced back to the pioneering work of Ito and Yamabe [103]. Roughly speaking the above method consists of the following idea. Let u be a solution to the parabolic equation

$$div\,(a(x)\nabla u) - \partial_t u + b(x) \cdot \nabla u + c(x)\,u = 0 \tag{1.12}$$

and let t_0 be fixed, then $u(., t_0)$ can be continued to a solution $U(x, y)$, $y \in (-\delta, \delta)$, $\delta > 0$, of an elliptic equation in the variables x and y. In this way some unique continuation properties (and inequalities) of solutions to elliptic equations can be transfered to solutions to equation (1.12). In [108] the regularity assumption on the matrix a are very strong, but in 1990 Lin [112] has employed the same technique to prove the spacelike strong unique continuation properties for solution to (1.12) assuming a merely Lipschitz continuous. In [36], [37] the elliptic continuation technique has been used to prove some two-sphere one-cylinder inequality at the boundary (with Dirichlet or Neumann condition) for solution to (1.12).

A very important step towards the proof of the spacelike strong unique continuation property for parabolic equation with time dependent coefficients consists in proving the following strong unique continuation properties: let u be a solution of $Lu = 0$ in $D \times (0, T)$, and $(x_0, t_0) \in D \times (0, T)$ then $u(., t_0)$ vanishes whenever

$$u(x,t) = O\left(\left(|x - x_0|^2 + |t - t_0|\right)^{N/2}\right), \text{ for every } N \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Such a properties has been proved for the first time by Poon [125] when $Lu = \partial_t u - \Delta u + b(x,t) \cdot \nabla u + c(x,t)\, u$, $D = \mathbb{R}^n$ and u satisfies some growth condition at infinity. Hence in [125] the strong unique continuation property has been not yet proved as a local property. Such a local strong unique continuation property has been proved, by using Carleman estimates techniques, in [57] for the operator $Lu = \partial_t u - div\,(a(x,t)\, \nabla u) + b(x,t) \cdot \nabla u + c(x,t)\, u$ when a is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the parabolic distance and b, c are bounded. In [8] the spacelike strong unique continuation has been derived as a consequence of the mentioned theorem of [57] and of the local behaviour of solutions to parabolic equation proved in [7]. In [64] the same spacelike strong unique continuation property has been proved as a consequence of a refined version of the Carleman estimate proved in [57]. The natural quantitative versions, that is the two-sphere one cylinder inequality and doubling inequality on characteristic hyperplane, have been proved in [60]. In the present paper, Subsections 3.1 and 3.2 are devoted to a complete proof of the two-sphere one-cylinder inequality (at the interior and at the boundary) and a simplified version of the proof of the Carleman estimate proved in [57] and [64]. Quite recently the spacelike strong unique continuation property has been proved in [89] with some improvement on the regularity assumption on coefficients of operator L.

The two-sphere one-cylinder inequalities are the essential tools to prove the stability estimate of logarithmic type for the inverse parabolic problems presented at the beginning of his paper, see Section 4 and, in particular Theorem 4.0.3, for details.

Finally let us give the plan of the paper.

Section 2: Main Notations and Definitions.

Section 3: Quantitative estimate of unique continuation.

Such a Section is subdivided in the following five Subsections.

Subsection 3.1: Parabolic equations with time independent coefficients,

Subsection 3.2: Carleman estimate,

Subsection 3.3: Two-sphere one-cylinder inequalities,
Subsection 3.4: Smallness propagation estimate,
Subsection 3.5:Stability estimates from Cauchy data.

Section 4: Stability estimates for Dirichlet inverse problem with unknown time-varying boundaries.
Such a Section is subdivided in the following four Subsections.
Subsection 4.1: Proof of Theorem 4.0.3 (it s the main Theorem of 4),
Subsection 4.2: Proofs of Propositions 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.1.6 (the statements of such propositions are given in Subsection 4.1),
Subsection 4.3: Some extensions of Theorem 4.0.3,

Section 5: Exponential instability,
such a Section 5 is subdivided in the following two Subsections,
Subsubsection 5.1: Exponential instability of the Dirichlet inverse problem with time-varying unknown boundary,
Subsubsection 5.1: Stability properties of the Dirichlet inverse problem with unknown boundary independent on time.

2 Main Notations and Definitions

For every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, $x = (x_1, ..., x_n)$, we shall set $x = (x', x_n)$, where $x' = (x_1, ..., x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. We shall use $X = (x, t)$ to denote a point in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. For every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $X = (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ we shall set $|x| = \left(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2\right)^{1/2}$ and $|X| = \left(|x|^2 + |t|\right)^{1/2}$. Let r be a positive number. For every $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we shall denote by $B_r(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \ |x - x_0| < r\}$ (the n-dimensional open ball of radius r centered at x_0) and $B'_r(x'_0) = \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : \ |x' - x'_0| < r\right\}$ (the $(n-1)$-dimensional open ball of radius r centered at x'_0). We set generally $B_r = B_r(0)$ and $B'_r = B'_r(0)$. We shall denote by $B_r^+ = \{x \in B_r : x_n > 0\}$. For every $X_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ we shall set $Q_r(X_0) = B_r(x_0) \times \left(t_0 - r^2, t_0\right)$.

Let I be an interval of $\mathbb{R}$ and let $\{D(t)\}_{t \in I}$ be a family of subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$, we shall denote $D(I) = \bigcup\limits_{t \in I} D(t) \times \{t\}$.

Given a sufficiently smooth function u of x and t, we shall denote $\partial_i u = \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}$, $\partial_{ij}^2 u = \dfrac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$, $i, j = 1, ..., n$ and $\partial_t u = \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t}$. For a multi-index $\beta = (\beta_1, ..., \beta_n)$, $\beta_i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $i = 1, ..., n$ and $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, we shall denote, as usual, $\partial_x^\beta \partial_t^k u = \dfrac{\partial^{|\beta|+k} u}{\partial x_1^{\beta_1} ... \partial x_n^{\beta_n} \partial t^k}$, where $|\beta| = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i$. Also, we shall write $\nabla(.) = \nabla_x(.)$, $div(.) = div_x(.)$.

Let D be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, f a function defined on D and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, we shall set

$$[f]_{\alpha;D}=\sup\left\{\frac{|f(x,t)-f(y,\tau)|}{\left(|x-y|^2+|t-\tau|\right)^{\alpha/2}}:\ (x,t),(y,\tau)\in D,\ (x,t)\neq(y,\tau)\right\}.$$

If $\alpha\in(0,2]$ we shall set

$$\langle f\rangle_{\alpha;D}=\sup\left\{\frac{|f(x,t)-f(x,\tau)|}{|t-\tau|^{\alpha/2}}:\ (x,t),(x,\tau)\in D,\ t\neq\tau\right\}.$$

Let k be a positive integer number, D an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, f a sufficiently smooth function and $\alpha\in(0,1]$. We shall denote by

$$[f]_{k+\alpha;D}=\sum_{|\beta|+2j=k}\left[\partial_x^\beta\partial_t^j f\right]_{\alpha;D}\ ,$$

$$\langle f\rangle_{k+\alpha;D}=\sum_{|\beta|+2j=k-1}\left\langle\partial_x^\beta\partial_t^j f\right\rangle_{1+\alpha;D}.$$

If $\alpha\in(0,1]$ and $[f]_{\alpha;D}$ is finite, we shall say that f is *Hölder continuous* (*Lipschitz continuous* whenever $\alpha=1$) in D or that f belongs to $C^{0,\alpha}$. Let k be a positive integer number, $\alpha\in(0,1]$ and let D be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, we shall say that f belongs to the class $C^{k,\alpha}$ whenever for every multi-index β and every nonnegative integer number j such that $|\beta|+2j\leq k$ there exist the derivatives $\partial_x^\beta\partial_t^j f$ and the quantities $\sup_D\left|\partial_x^\beta\partial_t^j f\right|$, $[f]_{k+\alpha;D}$ and $\langle f\rangle_{k+\alpha;D}$ are finite. If f is a function which doesn't depend explicitly on t we shall continue to use the definition above, more precisely for a function $f:\Omega\to\mathbb{R}$, where $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^n$, we shall say that $f\in C^{k,\alpha}(\Omega)$ whenever, considering the function $\widetilde{f}:\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$, $\widetilde{f}(x,t)=f(x)$ for every $(x,t)\in\Omega\times\mathbb{R}$, we have $\widetilde{f}\in C^{k,\alpha}(\Omega\times\mathbb{R})$.

Let $X_0=(x_0,t_0)$, $Y_0=(y_0,\tau_0)$ be two points of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, we shall say that $S:\mathbb{R}^{n+1}\to\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a *a rigid transformation of space coordinates under which we have* $X_0\equiv Y_0$ if $S(X)=(\sigma(x),t-t_0+\tau_0)$ where σ is an isometry of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\sigma(x_0)=y_0$.

Definition 2.0.1 *Let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Given a positive integer number k and $\alpha\in(0,1]$, we shall say that a portion Γ of $\partial\Omega$ is of class $C^{k,\alpha}$ with constants ρ_0, $E>0$ if for any $X_0\in\Gamma$, there exists a rigid tranformation of space coordinates under which we have $X_0\equiv 0$ and*

$$\Omega\cap\left(B'_{\rho_0}(0)\times\left(-\rho_0^2,\rho_0^2\right)\right)=\left\{X\in B'_{\rho_0}(0)\times\left(-\rho_0^2,\rho_0^2\right):\ x_n>\varphi(x',t)\right\},$$

where $\varphi\in C^{k,\alpha}\left(B'_{\rho_0}(0)\times\left(-\rho_0^2,\rho_0^2\right)\right)$ satisfying

$$\varphi(0,0)=|\nabla_{x'}\varphi(0,0)|=0$$

and

$$\|\varphi\|_{C^{k,\alpha}\left(B'_{\rho_0}(0)\times\left(-\rho_0^2,\rho_0^2\right)\right)}\leq E\rho_0.$$

Remark 2.0.2 *We have chosen to normalize all norms in such a way that their terms are dimensional homogeneous and coincide with the standard definition when $\rho_0 = 1$. For instance, for any $\varphi \in C^{k,\alpha}\left(B'_{\rho_0}(0) \times \left(-\rho_0^2, \rho_0^2\right)\right)$ we set*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi\|_{C^{k,\alpha}\left(B'_{\rho_0}(0)\times\left(-\rho_0^2,\rho_0^2\right)\right)} \quad = \quad & \sum_{l=0}^{k} \rho_0^k \sum_{|\beta|+2j=l} \left\| \partial_x^\beta \partial_t^j \varphi \right\|_{L^\infty\left(B'_{\rho_0}(0)\times\left(-\rho_0^2,\rho_0^2\right)\right)} + \\ & \rho_0^{k+\alpha} \left(\langle\varphi\rangle_{k+\alpha;B'_{\rho_0}(0)\times\left(-\rho_0^2,\rho_0^2\right)} + [\varphi]_{k+\alpha;B'_{\rho_0}(0)\times\left(-\rho_0^2,\rho_0^2\right)} \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we shall set

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \rho_0^{-(n+1)/2} \left(\int_\Omega u^2 dX \right)^{1/2} ,$$

where $dX = dxdt$.

For any matrix M in $G\left((0,T)\right)$, we shall denote its transposed by M^* and its trace by $\mathrm{tr}(M)$.

We shall fix the space dimension $n \geq 1$ throughout the paper. Therefore we shall omit the dependence of various quantities on n

We shall use the the letters C, C_0, C_1 ... to denote constants. The value of the constants may change from line to line, but we shall specified their dependence everywhere they appear.

3 Quantitative estimate of unique continuation

In Section 3.1 we present the so-called elliptic continuation technique due to Landis and Oleinik, [108]. In Section 3.2 we state and prove the Carleman estimate (Theorem 3.2.3 below) for parabolic operators proved in [57], [64], see also [60]. In order to prove such an inequality we adapt to the case of variable coefficients the approach used in [58] for the heat operator. In Section 3.3 we apply the Carleman estimate to prove the two-sphere one-cylinder inequality at the interior and at the (time varying) boundary. In Section 3.4 we shall prove a smallness propagation estimates for solutions to parabolic equations on a characteristic hyperplane up to a time varying portion of a Lipschitz boundary. Finally, in Section 3.5 we prove some sharp stability estimates for the Cauchy problem for parabolic equations.

3.1 Parabolic equations with time independent coefficients

In this section we present some quantitative estimates of unique continuation for solutions to parabolic equations whose coefficients do not depend on t. The method for deriving such estimates has been introduced in [108] and, concerning the smoothness assumption on the coefficients, has been improved in [112]. In what follows we give an outline of the above method and we limit ourselves to present detailed proofs only of the main points of the method, we omit the most technical proofs for which we refer to the quoted literature and especially to [36]. Throughout this section, for any positive number r, we shall denote by $\widetilde{B}_r$ the $(n+1)$-dimensional open ball of radius r centered at 0 and we shall denote by $\widetilde{B}^+_r = \left\{ x \in \widetilde{B}_r : x_{n+1} > 0 \right\}$.

In order to simplify the exposition we consider the equation

$$Lu := div\left(a\left(x\right)\nabla u\right) - \partial_t u = 0 \text{ , in } B_1 \times (0,1] , \tag{3.1}$$

where $a\left(x\right) = \left\{ a^{ij}\left(x\right) \right\}_{i,j=1}^n$ is a symmetric $n \times n$ matrix whose entries are real valued functions. When $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and x, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we assume that

$$\lambda \left|\xi\right|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^n a^{ij}\left(x\right)\xi_i \xi_j \leq \lambda^{-1}\left|\xi\right|^2 \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^n \left(a^{ij}\left(x\right) - a^{ij}\left(y\right) \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \Lambda \left|x-y\right| \ , \tag{3.3}$$

where λ and Λ are positive numbers with $\lambda \in (0,1]$.

Let $u \in H^{2,1}\left(B_1 \times (0,1)\right)$ be a solution to (3.1).Denoting by $\overline{u}$ the following extension of u

$$\overline{u} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} u\left(x,t\right), \text{ if } \left(x,t\right) \in B_1 \times (0,1), \\ -3u\left(x, 2-t\right) + 4u\left(x, \frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2}t\right), \text{ if } \left(x,t\right) \in B_1 \times [1,2), \end{array} \right. \tag{3.4}$$

we have $\overline{u} \in H^{2,1}\left(B_1 \times (0,2)\right)$ and, [61],

$$\left\|\overline{u}\right\|_{H^{2,1}\left(B_1 \times (0,2)\right)} \leq C \left\|u\right\|_{H^{2,1}\left(B_1 \times (0,1)\right)}, \tag{3.5}$$

where C is an absolute constant.
Let $\eta \in C^1\left([0,+\infty)\right)$ be a function satisfying $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, $\eta = 1$ in $[0,1]$, $\eta = 0$ in $[2,+\infty)$ and $\left|\eta'\right| \leq c$, in $[1,2]$. Moreover, denoting by $\widetilde{u}$ the trivial extension of $\eta\left(t\right)\overline{u}\left(x,t\right)$ to $(0,+\infty)$ (i.e. $\widetilde{u}\left(x,t\right) = 0$ if $t \geq 2$), let us denote by u_1, u_2 the weak solutions to the following initial-boundary value problems respectively

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} Lu_1 = 0 \text{ , in } B_1 \times (0,+\infty), \\ u_1 = 0 \text{ , on } \partial B_1 \times (0,+\infty), \\ u_1\left(.,0\right) = u\left(.,0\right) \text{ , in } B_1 \end{array} \right. \tag{3.6}$$

and

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} Lu_2 = 0 \text{ , in } B_1 \times (0,+\infty), \\ u_2 = \widetilde{u} \text{ , on } \partial B_1 \times (0,+\infty), \\ u_2\left(.,0\right) = 0 \text{ , in } B_1 \ . \end{array} \right. \tag{3.7}$$

Since $u_1 + u_2 = u$ on $\partial B_1 \times (0,1]$ and $\left(u_1 + u_2\right)\left(.,0\right) = u\left(.,0\right)$ in B_1, by uniqueness theorem for initial-boundary value problem for parabolic equations we have

$$u_1\left(x,1\right) + u_2\left(x,1\right) = u\left(x,1\right) \text{ , for every } x \in B_1. \tag{3.8}$$

In what follows we shall denote by $C_{\mathcal{P}}$ the constant appearing in the following Poincaré inequality

$$\int_{B_1} f^2(x)\,dx \leq C_{\mathcal{P}} \int_{B_1} |\nabla f(x)|^2\,dx \text{ , for every } f \in H_0^1(B_1) \text{ ,}$$

where we recall that $C_{\mathcal{P}} \leq 1$, [70], and $C_{\mathcal{P}} = \frac{1}{k_0^2}$, where k_0 is the smallest positive root of the Bessel function of first kind $J_{\frac{n-2}{2}}$, [46]. Let us denote

$$b_1 = \frac{\lambda}{C_{\mathcal{P}}} \text{ ,} \tag{3.9}$$

and

$$H = \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \|u(.,t)\|_{H^1(B_1)} \text{ .} \tag{3.10}$$

Proposition 3.1.1 *Let u and u_2 be as above. We have*

$$\|u_2(.,t)\|_{H^1(B_1)} \leq C_1 H e^{-b_1(t-2)_+} \text{ , for every } t \in (0,+\infty) \text{,} \tag{3.11}$$

($(t-2)_+$ is equal to $t-2$ if $t \geq 2$ and it is equal to 0 if $t < 2$) where C_1, $C_1 > 1$, depends on λ and Λ only.

Proof. Let

$$v = u_2 - \widetilde{u} \text{ ,}$$

where $\widetilde{u}$ is the function defined above. Denoting $F = -L\widetilde{u}$, we have

$$\begin{cases} Lv = F \text{ , in } B_1 \times (0,+\infty) \text{,} \\ v = 0 \text{ , on } \partial B_1 \times (0,+\infty) \text{,} \\ v(.,0) = -u(.,0) \text{ , in } B_1 \text{.} \end{cases} \tag{3.12}$$

We claim

$$\|u_2(.,t)\|_{L^2(B_1)} \leq CH \text{ , for every } t \in [0,2] \text{,} \tag{3.13}$$

$$\|\nabla u_2(.,t)\|_{L^2(B_1)} \leq CH \text{ , for every } t \in [0,2] \text{,} \tag{3.14}$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only.

In order to prove (3.13) let us multiply the first equation in (3.12) by v and integrate over $B_1 \times (0,t)$. We get, for every $t \in [0,2]$,

$$\int_{B_1} v^2(x,t)\,dx \leq 2\|F\|^2_{L^2(B_1\times(0,2))} + \int_{B_1} u^2(x,0)\,dx + 2\int_0^t d\tau \int_{B_1} v^2(x,\tau)\,dx.$$

By applying Gronwall inequality we have

$$\int_{B_1} v^2(x,t)\,dx \leq e^4\left(2\|F\|^2_{L^2(B_1\times(0,2))} + H^2\right) \text{ , for every } t \in [0,2] \text{.} \tag{3.15}$$

Now by (3.5) and regularity estimate for parabolic equations we have

$$\|F\|_{L^2(B_1\times(0,2))} \leq CH, \tag{3.16}$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only. From this inequality and (3.15) we obtain (3.13).
In order to prove (3.14) let us multiply the first equation in (3.12) by $\partial_t v$ and integrate over $B_1 \times (0,t)$. We obtain

$$\lambda \int_{B_1} \left|\nabla v\left(x,t\right)\right|^2 dx \leq \lambda^{-1} \int_{B_1} \left|\nabla u\left(x,0\right)\right|^2 dx + 2\left\|F\right\|^2_{L^2(B_1\times(0,2))},$$

so, by (3.10) and (3.16) we have (3.14). Claims are proved.

Now let us denote by μ_k, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the decreasing sequence of eigenvalues associated to the problem

$$\begin{cases} div\left(a\nabla\varphi\right) = \mu\varphi, \text{ in } B_1, \\ \varphi = 0, \text{ on } \partial B_1 \end{cases} \tag{3.17}$$

and by φ_k, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the corresponding eigenfunctions normalized by

$$\int_{B_1} \varphi_k^2\left(x\right) dx = 1,\ k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We have

$$0 > -b_1 \geq \mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq ... \geq \mu_k \geq ... \,. \tag{3.18}$$

Since $u_2 = 0$, on $\partial B_1 \times [2,+\infty)$, we have

$$u_2\left(x,t\right) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_k \varphi_k\left(x\right) e^{\mu_k(t-2)} \text{ , for every } t \geq 2, \tag{3.19}$$

where

$$\beta_k = \int_{B_1} u_2\left(x,2\right) \varphi_k\left(x\right) dx,\ k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since $u_2\left(.,2\right) = v\left(.,2\right)$ in B_1, by (3.13), (3.18) and (3.19) we have

$$\int_{B_1} u_2^2\left(x,t\right) dx = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_k^2 e^{2\mu_k(t-2)} \tag{3.20}$$

$$\leq e^{-2b_1(t-2)} \int_{B_1} u_2^2\left(x,2\right) dx \leq CH^2 e^{-2b_1(t-2)}, \text{ for every } t \geq 2,$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only.
Moreover, for every $t \geq 2$, we have

$$\int_{B_1} a\left(x\right) \nabla u_2\left(x,t\right) \cdot \nabla u_2\left(x,t\right) dx \tag{3.21}$$

$$= -\int_{B_1} \partial_t u_2\left(x,t\right) u_2\left(x,t\right) dx = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left|\mu_k\right| \beta_k^2 e^{2\mu_k(t-2)}.$$

By choosing $t=2$ in (3.21) and using (3.14) we get

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\left|\mu_k\right|\beta_k^2\leq CH^2, \tag{3.22}$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only.
By (3.18), (3.21) and (3.22) we derive

$$\int_{B_1}\left|\nabla u_2\left(x,t\right)\right|^2dx\leq CH^2e^{-2b_1(t-2)},\text{ for every } t\geq 2, \tag{3.23}$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only.

Finally, from (3.13), (3.14), (3.20) and (3.23) we get (3.11).■

Let us still denote by u_2 the extension by 0 of u_2 to $B_1\times\mathbb{R}$ and let us consider the Fourier tranform of u_2 with respect to the t variable

$$\widehat{u}_2\left(x,\mu\right)=\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}e^{-i\mu t}u_2\left(x,t\right)dt=\int_{0}^{+\infty}e^{-i\mu t}u_2\left(x,t\right)dt\ ,\ \mu\in\mathbb{R}\ . \tag{3.24}$$

We have that $\widehat{u}_2$ satisfies

$$div\left(a\left(x\right)\nabla\widehat{u}_2\left(x,\mu\right)\right)-i\mu\widehat{u}_2\left(x,\mu\right)=0\ ,\text{ if }\ \left(x,\mu\right)\in B_1\times\mathbb{R}. \tag{3.25}$$

Proposition 3.1.2 *Let $\widehat{u}_2$ be as above. We have, for every $\mu\in\mathbb{R}$,*

$$\left\|\widehat{u}_2\left(.,\mu\right)\right\|_{L^2\left(B_{1/2}\right)}\leq cC_1\lambda^{-1}H\left(2+\frac{1}{b_1}\right)e^{-|\mu|^{1/2}\delta}\ , \tag{3.26}$$

where c is an absolute constant, C_1 is the constant that appears in (3.11) and δ is given by

$$\delta=\frac{\lambda}{8\pi e}\ . \tag{3.27}$$

Proof. Let us denote, for every $\mu,\xi\in\mathbb{R}$, $x\in B_1$

$$v\left(x,\xi;\mu\right)=e^{i|\mu|^{1/2}\xi}\widehat{u}_2\left(x,\mu\right)\ .$$

For every $\mu\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$, the function $v\left(.,.;\mu\right)$ solves the uniformly elliptic equation

$$div\left(a\left(x\right)\nabla v\left(x,\xi;\mu\right)\right)+i\text{sgn}\left(\mu\right)\partial_\xi^2v\left(x,\xi;\mu\right)=0,\text{ in } B_1\times\mathbb{R}. \tag{3.28}$$

Let $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and denote by $r_m=1-\frac{m}{2k}$, for every $m\in\{0,1,...,k\}$. Moreover set

$$h_m\left(s\right)=\begin{cases}0,\text{ if }\ |s|>r_m,\\ \frac{1}{2}\left(1+\cos 2\pi k\left(r_{m+1}-s\right)\right)\ ,\text{ if } r_{m+1}\leq|s|\leq r_m,\\ 1,\ |s|<r_{m+1},\end{cases}$$

$$\eta_m(x,\xi) = h_m(|x|)\, h_m(|\xi|)$$

and

$$v_m(x,\xi;\mu) = \partial_\xi^m v(x,\xi;\mu) \ \ ,\ m \in \{0,1,...,k\}\,.$$

We have that $v_m(.,.;\mu)$ satisfies

$$div\,(a(x)\nabla v_m(x,\xi;\mu)) + i\mathrm{sgn}(\mu)\,\partial_\xi^2 v_m(x,\xi;\mu) = 0, \text{ in } B_1\times\mathbb{R}. \tag{3.29}$$

Multiplying equation (3.29) by $\overline{v}_m(x,\xi;\mu)\,\eta_m^2(x,\xi)$ (here $\overline{v}_m$ denotes the complex conjugate of v_m) and integrating over $D_m = B_{r_m}\times(-r_m,r_m)$, we obtain

$$\int_{D_m}(a\nabla v_m\cdot\nabla\overline{v}_m)\,\eta_m^2 dxd\xi + \int_{D_m}|\partial_\xi v_m|^2\,\eta_m^2 dxd\xi \le C_2 m^2\int_{D_m}|v_m|^2\,\eta_m^2 dxd\xi.$$

where $C_2 = \frac{8\sqrt{2}\pi^2}{\lambda}$.
Therefore, for every $m\in\{0,1,...,k\}$, we have

$$\int_{D_{m+1}}\left|\partial_\xi^{m+1}v\right|^2 dxd\xi \le \frac{C_2 m^2}{\lambda}\int_{D_m}\left|\partial_\xi^m v\right|^2 dxd\xi\ . \tag{3.30}$$

By iteration of (3.30) for $m = 0,1,...,k-1$, we get

$$\int_{B_{1/2}\times(-1/2,1/2)}\left|\partial_\xi^k v\right|^2 dxd\xi \le 2\left(\frac{C_2k^2}{\lambda}\right)^k\int_{B_1}|\widehat{u}_2(x,\mu)|^2\,dx\ . \tag{3.31}$$

Now, let us estimate the integral at the right-hand side of (3.31). By (3.11) and Schwarz inequality we have

$$\int_{B_1}|\widehat{u}_2(x,\mu)|^2\,dx = \int_{B_1}\left|\int_0^{+\infty}e^{-i\mu t}u_2(x,t)\,dt\right|^2 dx$$

$$\le \int_{B_1}dx\left(\int_0^{+\infty}e^{-b_1(t-2)_+}dt\right)\left(\int_0^{+\infty}e^{-b_1(t-2)_+}u_2^2(x,t)\,dt\right) \le cC_1^2\left(2+\frac{1}{b_1}\right)^2,$$

where c is an an absolute constant and C_1 is the constant that appears in (3.11).
By the just obtained inequality and by (3.31) we get, for every $k\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\int_{B_{1/2}\times(-1/2,1/2)}\left|\partial_\xi^k v\right|^2 dxd\xi \le cC_1^2H^2\left(2+\frac{1}{b_1}\right)^2\left(\frac{C_2k^2}{\lambda}\right)^k\ , \tag{3.32}$$

where c is an absolute constant.
For fixed $\mu\in\mathbb{R}\smallsetminus\{0\}$ and $\psi\in L^2\left(B_{1/2},\mathbb{C}\right)$, let us denote by Ψ the function

$$\Psi(\xi) = \int_{B_{1/2}}v(x,\xi;\mu)\,\overline{\psi(x)}dx,\ \xi\in\left(-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\right)\ .$$

Recall now the inequality

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty(J)} \le c\left(|J|\,\|f\|_{L^2(J)}^2 + |J|^{-1}\,\|f'\|_{L^2(J)}^2\right)^{1/2}, \tag{3.33}$$

where J is a bounded interval of $\mathbb{R}$, $|J|$ is the lenght of J and c is an absolute constant.
By (3.32) and (3.33), we have that for every $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $\xi \in \left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$,

$$\left|\Psi^{(k)}(\xi)\right| \leq cC_1 H \|\psi\|_{L^2\left(B_{1/2}\right)} \left(2 + \frac{1}{b_1}\right) \left(\left(C_2 \lambda^{-1}\right)^{1/2} k\right)^k . \tag{3.34}$$

By using inequality (3.34) and the power series of Ψ at any point ξ_0 such that $Re(\xi_0) \in \left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, $Re(\xi_0) = 0$, we have that the function Ψ can be analitically extended in the rectangle

$$Q = \left\{\xi \in \mathbb{C} : Re(\xi) \in \left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right), \; Im(\xi) \in (-2\delta, 2\delta)\right\} ,$$

where $\delta = \dfrac{\lambda}{8\pi e}$. Denoting by $\widetilde{\Psi}$ such an analitic extension of Ψ to Q we have

$$\left|\widetilde{\Psi}(-i\delta)\right| \leq c\lambda^{-1} C_1 H \|\psi\|_{L^2\left(B_{1/2}\right)} \left(2 + \frac{1}{b_1}\right) , \tag{3.35}$$

where c is an absolute constant.
On the other side, by the definition of v we have

$$\widetilde{\Psi}(-i\delta) = \int_{B_{1/2}} e^{|\mu|^{1/2}\delta} \widehat{u}_2(x, \mu) \overline{\psi(x)} ,$$

so that, by (3.35), we obtain (3.26).■

Estimate (3.26) allows us to define, for every $x \in B_{1/2}$ and $y \in \left(-\sqrt{2}\delta, \sqrt{2}\delta\right)$, the function

$$w_2(x, y) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{i\mu} \widehat{u}_2(x, \mu) \cosh\left(\sqrt{-i\mu} y\right) d\mu , \tag{3.36}$$

where

$$\sqrt{-i\mu} = |\mu|^{1/2} e^{-\frac{\pi}{4} i \operatorname{sgn}(\mu)}.$$

It turns out that w_2 satisfies the following elliptic equation

$$div\left(a(x) \nabla w_2(x, y)\right) + \partial_y^2 w_2(x, y) = 0, \text{ in } B_{1/2} \times \left(-\sqrt{2}\delta, \sqrt{2}\delta\right) \tag{3.37}$$

and the following conditions at $y = 0$

$$w_2(x, 0) = u_2(x, 1) \text{ , for every } x \in B_{1/2} , \tag{3.38}$$

$$\partial_y w_2(x, 0) = 0 \text{ , for every } x \in B_{1/2}. \tag{3.39}$$

Moreover, notice that w_2 is an even function with respect to the variable y.

Now let us consider the function u_1. Since such a function is the solution to initial-boundary value problem (3.6) we have

$$u_1(x,t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k e^{\mu_k t} \varphi_k(x) \ , \tag{3.40}$$

where μ_k and $\varphi_k(x)$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, are respectively the decreasing sequence of eigenvalues and the corresponding eigenfunctions associated to the problem

$$\begin{cases} div\,(a\nabla\varphi) = \mu\varphi, \text{ in } B_1, \\ \varphi = 0, \text{ on } \partial B_1 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\alpha_k = \int_{B_1} u_1(x,0)\, \varphi_k(x)\, dx, \ k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let us define

$$w_1(x,y) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k e^{\mu_k} \varphi_k(x) \cosh\left(\sqrt{|\mu_k|}y\right) \ , \tag{3.41}$$

It is easy to check that w_1 is a solution to equation (3.37) and satisfies the following conditions

$$w_1(x,0) = u_1(x,1) \ , \text{ for every } x \in B_1 \ , \tag{3.42}$$

$$\partial_y w_1(x,0) = 0 \ , \text{ for every } x \in B_1. \tag{3.43}$$

Moreover, notice that w_1 is an even function with respect to the variable y. Now, let us define

$$w = w_1 + w_2, \text{ in } B_{1/2} \times \left(-\sqrt{2}\delta, \sqrt{2}\delta\right) \ , \tag{3.44}$$

we have that w is again a solution to equation (3.37), it is an even function with respect to the variable y and, as a consequence of (3.8), (3.38), (3.42), we have that $w(x,0) = u(x,1)$ for every $x \in B_{1/2}$. In addition by (3.39) and (3.43) we get $\partial_y w(x,0) = 0$, for every $x \in B_{1/2}$. Also, observe that by (3.26), (3.36) and (3.41) we derive

$$\|w(.,y)\|_{L^2(B_{1/2})} \leq c\frac{C_1 H}{\lambda\delta}\left(1 + \frac{1}{b_1}\right) \ , \text{ for every } y \in \left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2}\right) \ . \tag{3.45}$$

Indeed, if $y \in \left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2}\right)$ then, by Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\|w_2(.,y)\|^2_{L^2(B_{1/2})} = \int_{B_{1/2}} dx \left| \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{i\mu} \widehat{u}_2(x,\mu) \cosh\left(\sqrt{-i\mu}y\right) d\mu \right|^2$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{B_{1/2}} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\widehat{u}_2(x,\mu)|^2 e^{2\delta|\mu|^{1/2}} d\mu \right) \left(\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\delta\left(2-\sqrt{2}\right)|\mu|^{1/2}} d\mu \right)$$

$$\leq c\left(\frac{C_1 H}{\lambda\delta}\left(1+\frac{1}{b_1}\right)\right)^2 ,$$

where c is an absolute constant and C_1 is the constant that appears in (3.11). Moreover, for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\|w_1(.,y)\|^2_{L^2(B_1)} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k^2 e^{2\mu_k} \cosh^2\left(\sqrt{|\mu_k|}y\right)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k^2 = \|u(.,0)\|^2_{L^2(B_1)} \leq H^2.$$

By the inequalities obtained above we get (3.45).

In the following proposition we summarize the results obtained above

Proposition 3.1.3 *Let w be the function defined in (3.44). Then w is a solution to the equation*

$$div\left(a(x)\nabla w(x,y)\right) + \partial_y^2 w(x,y) = 0, \text{ in } B_{1/2} \times \left(-\sqrt{2}\delta, \sqrt{2}\delta\right) \tag{3.46}$$

and w satisfies the following conditions

$$w(x,0) = u(x,1) \text{ , for every } x \in B_1 \text{ ,} \tag{3.47}$$

$$\partial_y w(x,0) = 0 \text{ , for every } x \in B_1. \tag{3.48}$$

Moreover w is an even function with respect to the variable y and w satisfies inequality (3.45).

The following lemma is nothing else than a stability estimate for the elliptic Cauchy problem (3.46)-(3.48). A detailed proof of such a lemma can be found in Lemma 3.1.5 of [36].

Lemma 3.1.4 *Let w be the function defined in (3.44). Then there exist constants C, $C > 1$, γ_0, β, $\gamma_0, \beta \in (0,1)$, depending on λ only such that for every $r \leq \frac{1}{2}\gamma_0$ the following estimate holds true*

$$\int_{\widetilde{B}_r} w^2 dxdy \leq C\left(\int_{B_{\rho/2}} w^2(x,0)\,dx\right)^{\beta}\left(\int_{\widetilde{B}_{\widetilde{\rho}}} w^2 dxdy\right)^{1-\beta} , \tag{3.49}$$

where $\rho = \frac{8\sqrt{2}e\pi}{3\lambda} r$ and $\widetilde{\rho} = 2\sqrt{2}\rho$.

Now we recall the three sphere inequality for elliptic equations [91]. In what follows we denote by $\widetilde{a}(x,y) = \left\{\widetilde{a}^{ij}(x,y)\right\}_{i,j=1}^{n+1}$ a symmetric $(n+1)\times(n+1)$ matrix whose entries are real valued functions. When $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ we assume that

$$\widetilde{\lambda}|\xi|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^{n+1} \widetilde{a}^{ij}(x,y)\,\xi_i\xi_j \leq \widetilde{\lambda}^{-1}|\xi|^2 \tag{3.50}$$

and, for every $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$,

$$\left(\sum_{l,j=1}^{n+1} \left(\widetilde{a}^{ij}(x_1, y_1) - \widetilde{a}^{ij}(x_2, y_2) \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \widetilde{\Lambda} \left(|x_1 - x_2| + |y_1 - y_2| \right) \ , \tag{3.51}$$

where $\widetilde{\lambda}$ and $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ are positive numbers with $\widetilde{\lambda} \in (0, 1]$.

Lemma 3.1.5 ***(three sphere inequality for elliptic equations)***. *Let* $\widetilde{a}(x, y) = \left\{ \widetilde{a}^{lj}(x, y) \right\}_{l,j=1}^{n+1}$ *satisfy (3.50), (3.51). Let* $\widetilde{w} \in H^1\left(\widetilde{B}_1 \right)$ *be a weak solution to*

$$div \left(\widetilde{a} \nabla \widetilde{w} \right) = 0 \ , \ in \ \widetilde{B}_1. \tag{3.52}$$

Then there exist constants γ_1, $\gamma_1 \in (0, 1)$, C, $C > 1$, *depending on* $\widetilde{\lambda}$ *and* $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ *only such that for every* r_1, r_2, r_3 *that satisfy* $0 < r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \frac{\lambda}{2} r_3 \leq \gamma_1$ *we have*

$$\int_{\widetilde{B}_{r_2}} \widetilde{w}^2 dxdy \leq C \left(\frac{r_3}{r_2} \right)^C \left(\int_{\widetilde{B}_{r_1}} \widetilde{w}^2 dxdy \right)^{\vartheta_0} \left(\int_{\widetilde{B}_{r_3}} \widetilde{w}^2 dxdy \right)^{1-\vartheta_0} , \tag{3.53}$$

where

$$\vartheta_0 := \vartheta_0(r_1, r_2, r_3) = \frac{\log\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\widetilde{\lambda} r_3}{2 r_2} \right)}{\log\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\widetilde{\lambda} r_3}{2 r_2} \right) + C \log \frac{2 r_2}{\widetilde{\lambda} r_1}} \ . \tag{3.54}$$

Theorem 3.1.6 ***(two-sphere one cylinder inequality for equation (3.1)).*** *Let* $u \in H^{2,1}(B_1 \times (0, 1))$ *be a solution to equation (3.1) and let (3.2), (3.3) be satisfied. Then there exist constants* γ_2, $\gamma_2 \in (0, 1)$, C, $C > 1$, *depending on* λ *and* Λ *only such that for every* r_1, r_2, r_3 *that satisfy* $0 < r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \gamma_2 r_3 \leq \gamma_2^2$ *we have*

$$\int_{B_{r_2}} u^2(x, 1)\, dx \leq K(r_2, r_3) H^{2(1-\beta\vartheta_1)} \left(\int_{B_{r_1}} u^2(x, 1)\, dx \right)^{\beta\vartheta_1} , \tag{3.55}$$

where

$$K(r_2, r_3) = C \frac{r_3}{r_3 - r_2} \left(\frac{r_3}{r_2} \right)^C \ ,$$

$$\vartheta_1 = \frac{\log\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\lambda r_3}{2 \widetilde{r}_2} \right)}{\log\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\lambda r_3}{2 \widetilde{r}_2} \right) + C \log \frac{2 \widetilde{r}_2}{\lambda b r_1}} \ , \tag{3.56}$$

$$\widetilde{r}_2 = (1 - s_\lambda) r_2 + s_\lambda r_3 \ , \ s_\lambda = \frac{\lambda}{4 - \lambda} \ , \ b = \frac{3\lambda}{4\sqrt{2} e \pi} \tag{3.57}$$

and β *is the same exponent that appears in inequality (3.49)*

Proof. Let us consider the function w introduced in (3.44). Recall that w satisfies (3.46), (3.47) and (3.48). Let r_1, r_2, r_3 satisfy

$$0 < r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \left(4 \max\left\{\sqrt{2}, \lambda^{-1}\right\}\right)^{-1} r_3 \leq \gamma_* \ ,$$

where $\gamma_* = \min\left\{\gamma_0, \frac{\gamma_1 \lambda \delta}{\sqrt{2}}\right\}$, γ_0 and γ_1 have been defined in Lemma 3.1.4 and Lemma 3.1.5 respectively, δ is given by (3.27). Let $\widetilde{r}_2$ and b be defined by (3.57), we have $0 < br_1 < r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \widetilde{r}_2 \leq \frac{\lambda}{2} r_3 \leq \gamma_1$. By applying Lemma 3.1.5 to the triplet of radii br_1, $\widetilde{r}_2$, r_3 we get

$$\int_{\widetilde{B}_{\widetilde{r}_2}} w^2 dxdy \leq C \left(\frac{r_3}{r_2}\right)^C \left(\int_{\widetilde{B}_{br_1}} w^2 dxdy\right)^{\vartheta_1} \left(\int_{\widetilde{B}_{r_3}} w^2 dxdy\right)^{1-\vartheta_1} \ , \tag{3.58}$$

where $\vartheta_1 = \vartheta_0 \left(br_1, r_2', r_3\right)$, with ϑ_0 defined by (3.56) and C depending on λ and Λ only.

Now, let us recall the following trace inequality. Given r, ρ, $0 < \rho < r$, $f \in H^1\left(B_r^+\right)$, we have

$$\int_{B_\rho} f^2(x,0)\, dx \leq c \left(\frac{r}{r^2 - \rho^2} \int_{\widetilde{B}_r^+} f^2(x,y)\, dxdy + r \int_{\widetilde{B}_r^+} \left(\partial_y f(x,y)\right)^2 dxdy\right) \ , \tag{3.59}$$

where c is an absolute constant.
Set $r_2^* = \frac{1}{2}\left(r_2 + \widetilde{r}_2\right)$. By Caccioppoli inequality and (3.59) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\widetilde{B}_{\widetilde{r}_2}} w^2 dxdy &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\widetilde{B}_{\widetilde{r}_2}} w^2 dxdy + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\widetilde{B}_{\widetilde{r}_2}} w^2 dxdy \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\widetilde{B}_{r_2^*}} w^2 dxdy + C\left(r_2 - \widetilde{r}_2\right)^2 \int_{\widetilde{B}_{r_2^*}} \left(\left|\nabla_x w\right|^2 + \left(\partial_y w\right)^2\right) dxdy \\
&\geq C'\left(r_3 - r_2\right) \left(\frac{r_2^*}{r_2^{*2} - r_2^2} \int_{\widetilde{B}_{r_2^*}} w^2 dxdy + r_2^* \int_{\widetilde{B}_{r_2^*}} \left(\partial_y w\right)^2 dxdy\right) \\
&\geq C''\left(r_3 - r_2\right) \int_{B_{r_2}} w^2(x,0)\, dx = C''\left(r_3 - r_2\right) \int_{B_{r_2}} u^2(x,1)\, dx \ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where C, C', C'' depend on λ only.
By the just obtained inequality and recalling (3.44) and (3.58) we obtain (3.55).■

Corollary 3.1.7 ***(Spacelike strong unique continuation for equation (3.1)).*** *Let $u \in H^{2,1}\left(B_1 \times (0,1)\right)$ satisfy equation (3.1).*
If for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\int_{B_r} u^2(x,1)\, dx = O\left(r^{2k}\right) \ , \ as\ r \to 0, \tag{3.60}$$

then

$$u(.,1) = 0 \ , \ in\ B_1 \ .$$

Proof. Let us fix $\rho \in \left(0, \gamma_2^2\right]$, where γ_2 has been introduced in Theorem 3.1.6. By applying Lemma 3.1.5 to the triplet of radii $r_1 = r$, $r_2 = \rho$ and $r_3 = \gamma_2$, by (3.60) and passing to the limit as r tends to 0, we get

$$\int_{B_\rho} u^2 (x, t_0)\, dx \leq C e^{-C_1 k} \text{ , for every } k \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{3.61}$$

where C depends on λ, Λ and $\|u\|_{L^2(B_1 \times (0,1))}$ only and C_1 depends on λ and Λ, only. Passing to the limit as $k \to \infty$, (3.61) yields $u\,(.,1) = 0$ in B_ρ. By iteration the thesis follows.■

3.2 Carleman estimate

In the present section it is convenient to carry out the calculations for the backward parabolic operator. Since in other parts of the paper we deal with the forward parabolic operator, for the reader convenience, when we consider the backward operator, we rename the time variable by s. Thus we denote by

$$Pu = \partial_i \left(g^{ij}(x, s)\, \partial_j u\right) + \partial_s u, \tag{3.62}$$

where $\left\{g^{ij}(x, s)\right\}_{i,j=1}^n$ is a symmetric $n \times n$ matrix whose entries are real functions. When $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $(x, s), (y, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ we assume that

$$\lambda |\xi|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^n g^{ij}(x, s)\, \xi_i \xi_j \leq \lambda^{-1} |\xi|^2 \tag{3.63}$$

and

$$\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^n \left(g^{ij}(x, s) - g^{ij}(y, \tau)\right)^2\right)^{1/2} \leq \Lambda \left(|x - y|^2 + |s - \tau|\right)^{1/2} \ , \tag{3.64}$$

where λ and Λ are positive numbers with $\lambda \in (0, 1]$.

In order to simplify the exposition and the calculations in the proof of Theorem 3.2.3 below we use some of the standard notations of Riemannian geometry, but always dropping the corresponding volume element in the definition of the Laplace-Beltrami operator associated to a Riemannian metric. More precisely, letting $g(x, s) = \{g_{ij}(x, s)\}_{i,j=1}^n$ to denote the inverse matrix of the matrix of coefficients of P, we have $g^{-1}(x, s) = \left\{g^{ij}(x, s)\right\}_{i,j=1}^n$ and we use the following notation when considering either a function v or two vector fields ξ and η:

1. $(\xi \mid \eta) = g_{ij}(x, s)\, \xi_i \eta_j$, $|\xi|_g^2 = g_{ij}(x, s)\, \xi_i \xi_j$,

2. $\nabla_x v = (\partial_1 v, ... \partial_n v)$, $\nabla_g v(x, s) = g^{-1}(x, s) \nabla_x v(x, s)$, $div(\xi) = \sum\limits_{i=1}^n \partial_i \xi_i$, $\Delta_g = div(\nabla_g)$.

With this notations the following formulae hold true when u, v and w are smooth functions

$$Pu = \Delta_g u + \partial_s u \ , \ \Delta_g \left(v^2\right) = 2v \Delta_g v + 2 \left|\nabla_g v\right|_g^2 \tag{3.65}$$

and

$$\int v\Delta_g w dx = \int w\Delta_g v dx = -\int (\nabla_g v \mid \nabla_g w)\, dx \ . \tag{3.66}$$

Also, we shall use the following Rellich-Nečas-Pohozaev identity

$$\begin{aligned} 2(\beta \mid \nabla_g v)\,\Delta_g v &= 2div\left(\left((\beta \mid \nabla_g v)\right)\nabla_g v\right) - div\left(\beta\left|\nabla_g v\right|_g^2\right) + \\ &\quad div(\beta)\left|\nabla_g v\right|_g^2 - 2\partial_i\beta^k g^{ij}\partial_j v\partial_k v + \beta^k\partial_k g^{ij}\partial_i v\partial_j v \ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.67}$$

where $\beta = \left(\beta^1, ..., \beta^n\right)$ is a smooth vector field.

Lemma 3.2.1 *Assume that* $\theta : (0,1) \to (0,+\infty)$ *satisfies*

$$0 \le \theta \le C_0 \ , \ \left|s\theta'(s)\right| \le C_0\theta(s) \ , \ \int_0^1 \left(1 + \log\frac{1}{s}\right)\frac{\theta(s)}{s}ds \le C_0 \ , \tag{3.68}$$

for some constant C_0*. Let* $\gamma \ge 1$ *and*

$$\sigma(s) = s\exp\left(-\int_0^{\gamma s}\left(1 - \exp\left(-\int_0^t \frac{\theta(\eta)}{\eta}d\eta\right)\right)\frac{dt}{t}\right) \ . \tag{3.69}$$

Then σ *is the solution to the Cauchy problem*

$$\frac{d}{ds}\log\left(\frac{\sigma}{s\sigma'}\right) = \frac{\theta(\gamma s)}{s} \ , \sigma(0) = 0, \ \sigma'(0) = 1 \tag{3.70}$$

and satisfies the following properties when $0 \le \gamma s \le 1$

$$se^{-C_0} \le \sigma(s) \le s \ , \tag{3.71}$$

$$e^{-C_0} \le \sigma'(s) \le 1 \ . \tag{3.72}$$

Proof. The proof is straightforward.■

Lemma 3.2.2 *For every positive number* μ *there exists a constant* C *such that for all* $y \ge 0$ *and* $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$*,*

$$y^\mu e^{-y} \le C\left(\varepsilon + \left(\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^\mu e^{-y}\right). \tag{3.73}$$

Proof. Consider the function $\varphi(y) = y - \varepsilon e^y$ on $[0,+\infty)$. Since the maximum of φ is $\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon} - 1$, $y - \varepsilon e^y < \log\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ and we get (3.73) when $\mu = 1$. If $\mu > 1$, we use the just proved inequality and the convexity of y^μ to get

$$\left(\frac{y}{\mu}\right)^\mu \le \left(\varepsilon^{1/\mu}e^{y/\mu} + \log\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{1/\mu}}\right)^\mu \le 2^{\mu-1}\left(\varepsilon e^y + \left(\frac{1}{\mu}\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^\mu\right) \ ,$$

that gives (3.73).

If $0 < \mu < 1$ we obtain (3.73) by the inequality for $\mu = 1$ and the inequality $(a+b)^{\mu} \leq a^{\mu} + b^{\mu}$.$\blacksquare$

In the sequel of this section we shall denote by

$$\theta(s) = s^{1/2}\left(\log\frac{1}{s}\right)^{3/2} \quad , \, s \in (0,1] \ . \tag{3.74}$$

It is easy to check that θ satisfies (3.68) of Lemma 3.2.1. We denote by σ the function defined in (3.69) where θ is given by (3.74) and $\gamma = \dfrac{\alpha}{\delta^2}$ with $\alpha \geq 1$, $\delta \in (0,1)$. In addition, for a given number $a > 0$, we shall denote by $\sigma_a(s) = \sigma(s+a)$.

Theorem 3.2.3 *Let P be the operator defined in (3.62) and assume that (3.63) and (3.64) are satisfied. Assume that $g^{ij}(0,0) = \delta^{ij}$, $i,j = 1,...,n$. Then there exist constants C, $C \geq 1$, $\eta_0 \in (0,1)$ and $\delta_1 \in (0,1)$ depending on λ only Λ only, such that for every α, $\alpha \geq 2$, a, $0 < a \leq \dfrac{\delta^2}{4\alpha}$, $\delta \in (0,\delta_1]$ and $u \in C_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,+\infty))$, with $\operatorname{supp} u \subset B_{\eta_0} \times \left[0, \dfrac{\delta^2}{2\alpha}\right)$, the following inequality holds true*

$$\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_{+}} \sigma_a^{-2\alpha-2}(s)\,\theta(\gamma(s+a))\,u^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}}\,dX \tag{3.75}$$

$$+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_{+}} (s+a)\,\sigma_a^{-2\alpha-2}(s)\,\theta(\gamma(s+a))\,|\nabla_g u|_g^2\, e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}}\,dX$$

$$\leq C\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_{+}} (s+a)^2\,\sigma_a^{-2\alpha-2}(s)\,|Pu|^2\, e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}}\,dX + C^{\alpha}\alpha^{\alpha}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_{+}}\left(u^2 + (s+a)\,|\nabla_g u|_g^2\right)dX$$

$$+C\alpha\sigma^{-2\alpha-1}(a)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u^2(x,0)\,e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4a}}\,dx - \frac{\sigma^{-2\alpha}(a)}{C}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}|(\nabla_g u)(x,0)|^2_{g(.,0)}\,e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4a}}\,dx.$$

Proof. We divide the proof into two steps. In the first step we prove that if the matrix g does not depend on s then there exists $\delta_0 \in (0,1)$ such that, for every $\delta \in (0,\delta_0]$, inequality (3.75) holds true. In the second step we prove inequality (3.75), for a suitable δ_1, in the general case. For the sake of brevity in what follows we prove the inequality when the matrix $g(x,s)$ and the function $u(x,s)$ are replaced by $\widetilde{g}(x,s) := g(x,s-a)$ and $\widetilde{u}(x,s) := u(x,s-a)$ respectively, so that $\widetilde{g}^{ij}(0,a) = \delta^{ij}$ and $\widetilde{u}$ is a function belonging to $C_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [a,+\infty))$. Also, the sign "$\widetilde{\ }$" over g and u will be dropped. Finally, we shall denote by $\int(.)\,dX$ the integral $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\times[a,+\infty)}(.)\,dX$.

STEP 1. Set $g(x) = g(x,a)$ and denote

$$P_0 u = \partial_i\left(g^{ij}(x)\,\partial_j u\right) + \partial_s u \ ,$$

$$\phi(x,s) = -\frac{|x|^2}{8s} - (\alpha+1)\log\sigma(s) \ ,$$

$$v = e^{\phi} u \ ,$$

$$Lv = e^{\phi} P_0 \left(e^{-\phi} v \right) \ .$$

Denoting by S and A the symmetric and skew-symmetric part of the operator sL respectively, we have

$$Sv = s \left(\Delta_g v + \left(\left| \nabla_g \phi \right|_g^2 - \partial_s \phi \right) v \right) - \frac{1}{2} v \ ,$$

$$Av = \frac{1}{2} \left(\partial_s (sv) + s \partial_s v \right) - s \left(v \Delta_g \phi + 2 \nabla_g v \cdot \nabla_g \phi \right)$$

and

$$sLv = Sv + Av.$$

Furthermore, noticing that

$$\Delta_g \phi = -\frac{n}{4s} + \psi_0 (x, s) \ ,$$

where

$$\psi_0 (x, s) = \frac{1}{4s} \left(n - tr \left(g^{-1} \right) - x_j \partial_i g^{ij} \right) \ ,$$

we write

$$sLv = Sv + A_0 v - s \psi_0 v \ , \tag{3.76}$$

where

$$A_0 v = \frac{1}{2} \left(\partial_s (sv) + s \partial_s v \right) - s \left(-\frac{n}{4s} v + 2 \left(\nabla_g v \mid \nabla_g \phi \right) \right) \ .$$

Noticing that $|\psi_0| \le \dfrac{C \Lambda |x|}{s}$, where C is an absolute constant, we have by (3.76)

$$2 \int s^2 |Lv|^2 dX \ge \int |Sv + A_0 v|^2 dX - 4 \int s^2 \psi_0^2 v^2 dX \tag{3.77}$$

$$\ge \int |Sv|^2 dX + \int |A_0 v|^2 dX + 2 \int S v A_0 v dX - 4 C^2 \Lambda^2 \int |x|^2 v^2 dX.$$

Let us consider the term $I := 2 \int S v A_0 v dX$ at the right-hand side of (3.77). We have

$$I = -2 \int s^2 \left(\Delta_g v + \left(\left| \nabla_g \phi \right|_g^2 - \partial_s \phi \right) v \right) \left(-\frac{n}{4s} v + 2 \left(\nabla_g v \mid \nabla_g \phi \right) \right) dX \tag{3.78}$$

$$+ \int s \left(\Delta_g v + \left(\left| \nabla_g \phi \right|_g^2 - \partial_s \phi \right) v \right) \left(\partial_s (sv) + s \partial_s v \right) dX$$

$$+ \int \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} v \left(\partial_s (sv) + s \partial_s v \right) + sv \left(-\frac{n}{4s} v + 2 \left(\nabla_g v \mid \nabla_g \phi \right) \right) \right\} dX$$

$$:= I_1 + I_2 + I_3 \ .$$

Evaluation of I_1.
We have

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 = -4\int s^2\Delta_g v\left(\nabla_g v \mid \nabla_g\phi\right)dX - 4\int s^2\left(\left|\nabla_g\phi\right|_g^2 - \partial_s\phi\right)v\left(\nabla_g v \mid \nabla_g\phi\right)dX \\ +\frac{n}{2}\int sv\Delta_g v dX + \frac{n}{2}\int s\left(\left|\nabla_g\phi\right|_g^2 - \partial_s\phi\right)v^2 dX := I_{11} + I_{12} + I_{13} + I_{14}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.79}$$

By using identity (3.67) with the vector field $\beta = \nabla_g\phi$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{11} &= \int\Big\{4s^2\partial_i\left(g^{kj}\partial_j\phi\right)g^{ih}\partial_h v\partial_k v - 2s^2\Delta_g\phi\left|\nabla_g v\right|_g^2 \\ &\quad -2s^2\left(g^{kj}\partial_j\phi\right)\left(\partial_k g^{hl}\partial_h v\partial_l v\right)\Big\}dX\ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.80}$$

Concerning the term I_{12}, by using the identity $v\nabla_g v = \frac{1}{2}\nabla_g\left(v^2\right)$ and by integration parts, we get

$$I_{12} = 2\int s^2 v^2\left\{\Delta_g\phi\left(\left|\nabla_g\phi\right|_g^2 - \partial_s\phi\right) + g^{ij}\partial_i\phi\partial_j\left(\left|\nabla_g\phi\right|_g^2 - \partial_s\phi\right)\right\}dX\ .$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} & g^{ij}\partial_i\phi\partial_j\left(\left|\nabla_g\phi\right|_g^2 - \partial_s\phi\right) \\ = & \left(2\partial_{jk}^2\phi g^{kh}\partial_h\phi + \partial_j g^{hk}\partial_k\phi\partial_h\phi\right)g^{ij}\partial_i\phi - \frac{1}{2}\partial_s\left(\left|\nabla_g\phi\right|_g^2\right)\ , \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} I_{12} = 2\int s^2 v^2\Delta_g\phi\left(\left|\nabla_g\phi\right|_g^2 - \partial_s\phi\right)dX \\ +4\int s^2 v^2\left(\partial_{jk}^2\phi g^{kh}\partial_h\phi + \frac{1}{2}\partial_j g^{hk}\partial_k\phi\partial_h\phi\right)g^{ij}\partial_i\phi dX - \int s^2 v^2\partial_s\left(\left|\nabla_g\phi\right|_g^2\right)dX\ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.81}$$

Concerning I_{13}, by the identity $v\Delta_g v = div\left(v\nabla_g v\right) - \left|\nabla_g v\right|_g^2$ and by integration by parts we obtain

$$I_{13} = -\frac{n}{2}\int s\left|\nabla_g v\right|_g^2 dX\ . \tag{3.82}$$

Now, let us introduce the notation

$$\psi_1 = \left(\frac{n}{2}s + 2s^2\Delta_g\phi\right)\left(\left|\nabla_g\phi\right|_g^2 - \partial_s\phi\right) + 2s^2\partial_j g^{hk}\partial_k\phi\partial_h\phi g^{ij}\partial_i\phi\ ,$$

$$Q\left(\nabla_g v\right) = -2s^2\psi_0\left|\nabla_g v\right|_g^2 - 2s^2\left(g^{kj}\partial_j\phi\right)\left(\partial_k g^{hl}\partial_h v\partial_l v\right)\ .$$

By (3.79), (3.80), (3.81), (3.82) we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= 4\int s^2\left\{\partial_i\left(g^{kj}\partial_j\phi\right)g^{ih}\partial_h v\partial_k v + \partial_{jk}^2\phi g^{kh}\partial_h\phi g^{ij}\partial_i\phi v^2\right\}dX \\ &\quad -\int s^2 v^2\partial_s\left(\left|\nabla_g\phi\right|_g^2\right)dX + \int\psi_1 v^2 dX + \int Q\left(\nabla_g v\right)dX\ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.83}$$

Evaluation of I_2.
We have

$$I_2 = \int sv\Delta_g v dX + \int 2s^2 \Delta_g v \partial_s v dX \tag{3.84}$$

$$+ \int 2s^2 \left(|\nabla_g \phi|_g^2 - \partial_s \phi \right) v \partial_s v dX + \int s \left(|\nabla_g \phi|_g^2 - \partial_s \phi \right) v^2 dX \ .$$

Now, we use the identities $v\Delta_g v = div\left(v\nabla_g v\right) - |\nabla_g v|_g^2$, $2\partial_s v \Delta_g v = 2div\left(\partial_s v \nabla_g v\right) - \partial_s \left(|\nabla_g v|_g^2 \right)$ and $2v\partial_s v = \partial_s \left(v^2\right)$ in the first, the second and the third integral at the right-hand side of (3.84) respectively, then we integrate by parts and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 \quad &= \quad \int s \left|\nabla_g v\right|_g^2 dX - \int s \left(|\nabla_g \phi|_g^2 - \partial_s \phi \right) v^2 - \int s^2 \partial_s \left(|\nabla_g \phi|_g^2 - \partial_s \phi \right) v^2 \\ &\quad + a^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left|\nabla_g v\left(x,a\right)\right|_g^2 dx - a^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\left|\nabla_g \phi\left(x,a\right)\right|_g^2 - \partial_s \phi\left(x,a\right) \right) v^2\left(x,a\right) dx \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.85}$$

Evaluation of I_3
We have

$$I_3 = -\int \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{n}{4} \right) v^2 dX - \int sv\partial_s v dX + \int 2sv\left(\nabla_g v \mid \nabla_g \phi\right) dX \ . \tag{3.86}$$

We use the identities $v\partial_s v = \dfrac{1}{2}\partial_s\left(v^2\right)$ and $2v\left(\nabla_g v \mid \nabla_g \phi\right) = div\left(v^2 \nabla_g \phi\right) - v^2 \Delta_g \phi$ respectively in the second and the third integral at the right-hand side of (3.86) then we integrate by parts and we obtain

$$I_3 = -\int s\psi_0 v^2 dX + \frac{a}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^2\left(x,a\right) dx \ . \tag{3.87}$$

Now, denote by

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 \quad &= \quad \int 4s^2 \partial_{jk}^2 \phi g^{kh} \partial_h \phi g^{ij} \partial_i \phi v^2 dX \\ &\quad - \int \left\{ s^2 \partial_s \left(2\left|\nabla_g \phi\right|_g^2 - \partial_s \phi \right) v^2 + s\left(|\nabla_g \phi|_g^2 - \partial_s \phi \right) v^2 \right\} dX \ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.88}$$

$$J_2 = \int \left\{ 4s^2 \partial_i \left(g^{kj} \partial_j \phi\right) g^{ih} \partial_h v \partial_k v + s\left|\nabla_g v\right|_g^2 + Q\left(\nabla_g v\right) \right\} dX \ , \tag{3.89}$$

$$J_3 = \int \left(\psi_1 - s\psi_0\right) v^2 dX \ , \tag{3.90}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_1 &= a^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left|\nabla_g v\left(x,a\right)\right|_g^2 dx + \frac{a}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^2\left(x,a\right) dx \\ &\quad - a^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\left|\nabla_g \phi\left(x,a\right)\right|_g^2 - \partial_s \phi\left(x,a\right) \right) v^2\left(x,a\right) dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.91}$$

By (3.78), (3.83), (3.85), (3.86) we have

$$I = J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + \mathcal{B}_1 \ . \tag{3.92}$$

Let us now estimate from below the terms J_k, $k = 1, 2, 3$, at the right-hand side of (3.92). We easily have

$$\partial_i \phi = -\frac{x_i}{4s} \ , \ \partial^2_{ij} \phi = -\frac{\delta_{ij}}{4s} \ , \ \left|\nabla_g \phi\right|^2_g = g^{ij}\left(x\right) \frac{x_i x_j}{16 s^2} \ , \tag{3.93}$$

$$\Delta_g \phi = -\frac{tr\left(g^{-1}\left(x\right)\right) + x_j \partial_i g^{ij}\left(x\right)}{4s} \ , \ \partial_s \phi = \frac{\left|x\right|^2}{8s^2} - \left(\alpha + 1\right) \frac{\sigma'\left(s\right)}{\sigma\left(s\right)} \ , \tag{3.94}$$

$$\partial^2_s \phi = -\frac{\left|x\right|^2}{4s^3} - \left(\alpha + 1\right) \left(\frac{\sigma'\left(s\right)}{\sigma\left(s\right)}\right)' \ , \ \partial_s \left(\left|\nabla_g \phi\right|^2_g\right) = -g^{ij}\left(x\right) \frac{x_i x_j}{8s^3} \ . \tag{3.95}$$

Observing that if $g^{ij}\left(x\right) = \delta^{ij}$, $i, j = 1, 2, ...n$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then the term under the integral sign at the right-hand side of (3.88) is equal to $\left(\alpha + 1\right) v^2 \frac{\sigma'}{\sigma} \frac{d}{ds} \left(\log \frac{\sigma}{s\sigma'}\right)$, it is easy to check that

$$J_1 \geq \left(\alpha + 1\right) \int s^2 v^2 \frac{\sigma'}{\sigma} \frac{d}{ds} \left(\log \frac{\sigma}{s\sigma'}\right) dX - C\Lambda \int \frac{\left|x\right|^3}{s} v^2 dX \ , \tag{3.96}$$

where C is an absolute constant.
Likewise, observing that if $g^{ij}\left(x\right) = \delta^{ij}$, $i, j = 1, 2, ...n$, $\in \mathbb{R}^n$, then the term under the integral sign at the right-hand side of (3.89) vanishes, so that the following inequality holds true

$$J_2 \geq -C\Lambda \int \left|x\right| s \left|\nabla_g v\right|^2_g dX \ , \tag{3.97}$$

where C is an absolute constant.
Now, let us consider J_3. Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be a number that we shall choose later, let σ be the function (3.69) where $\gamma = \frac{\alpha}{\delta^2}$, $\alpha \geq 1$ and θ is given by (3.74). We have

$$\left|\psi_1 - s\psi_0\right| \leq \left|\psi_1\right| + s\left|\psi_0\right| \leq C \left(\left|x\right| + \frac{\left|x\right|^3}{s} + \left(\alpha + 1\right) s \left|x\right| \frac{\sigma'}{\sigma}\right) \ ,$$

where C depends on λ, Λ only. By (3.71) and (3.72) we have

$$J_3 \geq -C \int \left(\frac{\left|x\right|^3}{s} + \left(\alpha + 1\right) \left|x\right|\right) v^2 dX \ , \tag{3.98}$$

for every $v \in C^\infty_0\left(\mathbb{R}^n \times [a, +\infty)\right)$ such that $supp\, v \subset B_1 \times \left[a, \frac{1}{\gamma}\right)$, where C depends on λ and Λ only.

Now by Lemma 3.2.1 and by (3.96), (3.97), (3.98) we get

$$\begin{aligned} I &\geq \frac{(\alpha+1)}{e^{C_0}}\int\theta(\gamma s)\,v^2dX - C\int\left((\alpha+1)\left|x\right| + \frac{\left|x\right|^3}{s}\right)v^2dX \qquad (3.99)\\ &-C\int\left|x\right|s\left|\nabla_g v\right|_g^2dX + \mathcal{B}_1\ , \end{aligned}$$

for every $v\in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n\times[a,+\infty))$ such that $supp\, v\subset B_1\times\left[a,\frac{1}{\gamma}\right)$, $\alpha\geq 1$, where C_0 is defined in Lemma 3.2.1 and C depends on λ and Λ only.

Let $\varepsilon_0\in(0,1]$ be a number that we shall choose later. We get

$$\int\left|Sv\right|^2dX \geq \varepsilon_0\int\left|Sv\right|^2dX = \varepsilon_0\int\left|(Sv+\theta(\gamma s)\,v) - \theta(\gamma s)\,v\right|^2dX \qquad (3.100)$$

$$\geq -2\varepsilon_0\int s\theta(\gamma s)\,v\Delta_g v dX - 2\varepsilon_0\int\left(s\left(\left|\nabla_g\phi\right|_g^2 - \partial_s\phi\right) - \frac{1}{2} + \theta(\gamma s)\right)\theta(\gamma s)\,v^2dX$$

$$= 2\varepsilon_0\int s\theta(\gamma s)\left(\left|\nabla_g v\right|_g^2 + \left|\nabla_g\phi\right|_g^2v^2\right)dX$$

$$-2\varepsilon_0\int\left(s\left(2\left|\nabla_g\phi\right|_g^2 - \partial_s\phi\right) - \frac{1}{2} + \theta(\gamma s)\right)\theta(\gamma s)\,v^2dX\ .$$

Now by (3.71), (3.72) and (3.93)-(3.95) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\left(s\left(2\left|\nabla_g\phi\right|_g^2 - \partial_s\phi\right) - \frac{1}{2} + \theta(\gamma s)\right)\theta(\gamma s)\right| \qquad (3.101)\\ \leq\ & C\left(\frac{\left|x\right|^3}{s} + (\alpha+1)\,\theta(\gamma s)\right)\ , \text{ for every } 0<\gamma s\leq\frac{1}{2},\ \alpha\geq 1\ , \end{aligned}$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only.
By (3.100) and (3.101) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int\left|Sv\right|^2dX &\geq 2\varepsilon_0\int s\theta(\gamma s)\left(\left|\nabla_g v\right|_g^2 + \left|\nabla_g\phi\right|_g^2v^2\right)dX \qquad (3.102)\\ &-C_1\varepsilon_0\int\left(\frac{\left|x\right|^3}{s} + (\alpha+1)\,\theta(\gamma s)\right)v^2dX\ , \end{aligned}$$

for every $v\in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n\times[a,+\infty))$ such that $supp\, v\subset B_1\times\left[a,\frac{1}{2\gamma}\right)$, $\alpha\geq 1$, where C_1 depends on λ and Λ only.
By the just obtained inequality and (3.99) we get

$$I + \int\left|Sv\right|^2dX \geq (\alpha+1)\left(\frac{1}{e^{C_0}} - C_1\varepsilon_0\right)\int\theta(\gamma s)\,v^2dX \qquad (3.103)$$

$$+2\varepsilon_0\int s\theta\left(\gamma s\right)\left(\left|\nabla_g v\right|_g^2+\left|\nabla_g\phi\right|_g^2 v^2\right)dX-C\int\left(\left(\alpha+1\right)\left|x\right|+\frac{\left|x\right|^3}{s}\right)v^2dX$$

$$-C\int\left|x\right|s\left(\left|\nabla_g v\right|_g^2+\left|\nabla_g\phi\right|_g^2 v^2\right)+\mathcal{B}_1\ ,$$

for every $v\in C_0^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^n\times[a,+\infty)\right)$ such that *supp* $v\subset B_1\times\left[a,\frac{1}{2\gamma}\right)$, $\alpha\geq 1$, where C depends on λ and Λ only and C_1 is the same constant that appears in (3.102).
Now we choose $\varepsilon_0=\dfrac{1}{2C_1e^{C_0}}$ at the right-hand side of (3.103), then, recalling (3.77) and coming back to the function u, we have

$$\int s^2\left|P_0u\right|^2e^{2\phi}dX\geq\frac{(\alpha+1)}{C}\int\theta\left(\gamma s\right)u^2e^{2\phi}dX \tag{3.104}$$

$$+\frac{1}{C}\int s\theta\left(\gamma s\right)\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2e^{2\phi}dX+\mathcal{B}_1$$

$$-C\int\left(\left(\alpha+1\right)\left|x\right|+\frac{\left|x\right|^3}{s}\right)u^2e^{2\phi}dX-C\int\left|x\right|s\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2e^{2\phi}dX\ ,$$

for every $u\in C_0^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^n\times[a,+\infty)\right)$ such that *supp* $u\subset B_1\times\left[a,\frac{1}{2\gamma}\right)$, $\alpha\geq 1$, where C, $C>1$, depends on λ and Λ only.
Now, we use Lemma 3.2.2 to prove the following estimates

$$\int\left(\left(1+\alpha\right)\left|x\right|+\frac{\left|x\right|^3}{s}\right)u^2e^{2\phi}dX\leq C\left(e^{C_0}\gamma\right)^{2\alpha+\frac{5}{2}}\int u^2dX \tag{3.105}$$

$$+C\alpha\delta\int\theta\left(\gamma s\right)u^2e^{2\phi}dX\ ,$$

$$\int\left|x\right|s\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2e^{2\phi}dX\leq C\left(e^{C_0}\gamma\right)^{2\alpha+\frac{3}{2}}\int s\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2dX \tag{3.106}$$

$$+C\delta\int\theta\left(\gamma s\right)s\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2e^{2\phi}dX\ ,$$

where C is an absolute constant.
By applying Lemma 3.2.2 with $\mu=\dfrac{1}{2}$, $y=\frac{|x|^2}{4s}$, $\varepsilon=(\gamma s)^{\frac{3}{2}+2\alpha}$ and by using (3.71) we have

$$\left|x\right|e^{2\phi}=\left(4s\right)^{1/2}\left(\frac{\left|x\right|^2}{4s}\right)^{1/2}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}\sigma^{-2(\alpha+1)} \tag{3.107}$$

$$\leq C\left(\left(\gamma s\right)^{\alpha+\frac{3}{2}}s^{1/2}\sigma^{-2(\alpha+1)}+s^{1/2}\left(\left(\frac{3}{2}+2\alpha\right)\log\frac{1}{\gamma s}\right)^{1/2}\sigma^{-2(\alpha+1)}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}\right)$$

$$\leq C'\left(\left(e^{C_0}\gamma\right)^{2\alpha+\frac{5}{2}}+\delta\theta\left(\gamma s\right)e^{2\phi}\right)\ ,$$

hence (3.106) follows.
Likewise, by applying Lemma 3.2.2 with $\mu=\dfrac{3}{2}$, $y=\frac{|x|^2}{4s}$, $\varepsilon=\left(\gamma s\right)^{\frac{3}{2}+2\alpha}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{|x|^3}{s}e^{2\phi}&=4\left(4s\right)^{1/2}\left(\frac{|x|^2}{4s}\right)^{3/2}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}\sigma^{-2(\alpha+1)} \qquad (3.108)\\ &\leq C\left(\left(e^{C_0}\gamma\right)^{2\alpha+2}+\alpha\delta\theta\left(\gamma s\right)e^{2\phi}\right)\ .\end{aligned}$$

By (3.107) and (3.108) we get (3.105).

Finally, by (3.104), (3.105) and (3.106) we have that there exists $\delta_0\in(0,1]$ such that for every $\delta\in(0,\delta_0]$, $\alpha\geq 1$, $u\in C_0^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^n\times[a,+\infty)\right)$ such that *supp* $u\subset B_1\times\left[a,\frac{1}{2\gamma}\right)$, the following estimate holds true

$$\begin{aligned}&\int s^2\left|P_0u\right|^2e^{2\phi}dX+C\left(e^{C_0}\gamma\right)^{2\alpha+\frac{5}{2}}\int\left(u^2+s\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2\right)e^{2\phi}dX \qquad (3.109)\\ \geq\ &\frac{\alpha+1}{C}\int\theta\left(\gamma s\right)u^2e^{2\phi}dX+\frac{1}{C}\int\theta\left(\gamma s\right)s\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2e^{2\phi}dX+\mathcal{B}_1,\end{aligned}$$

where $C\geq 1$ depends on λ and Λ only.

STEP 2. It is simple to check the following identity, for $k\in\{1,...,n\}$

$$\begin{aligned}P_0\left(\left(\partial_k u\right)^2\right)\ =\ &2\partial_k\left(\partial_k uP_0u\right)-2\partial_i\left(\partial_k u\left(\partial_k g^{ij}\left(x,a\right)\right)\partial_j u\right)\\ &-2\partial^2_{kk}uP_0u+2\left(\partial_k g^{ij}\left(x,a\right)\right)\partial_j u\partial^2_{ik}u+2g^{ij}\left(x,a\right)\partial^2_{ik}u\partial^2_{jk}u\ ,\end{aligned}$$

(recall that $\left(P_0u\right)(x,s)=\partial_j\left(g^{ij}\left(x,a\right)\partial_i u\left(x,s\right)\right)+\partial_s u\left(x,s\right)$). Now we multiply both sides of the above inequality by $\sigma^{1-2\alpha}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}$ and we integrate by parts. We obtain, for any $k\in\{1,...,n\}$,

$$2\int\left(g^{ij}\left(x,a\right)\partial^2_{ik}u\partial^2_{jk}u\right)\sigma^{1-2\alpha}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX \qquad (3.110)$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\leq\int\left(\partial_k u\right)^2\left|P_0^*\left(\sigma^{1-2\alpha}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}\right)\right|dX+2\int\left|\partial_k uP_0u\right|\left|\partial_k\left(\sigma^{1-2\alpha}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}\right)\right|dX\\ &+2\int\left|\partial_k g^{ij}\left(x,a\right)\partial_j u\partial_k u\right|\left|\partial_i\left(\sigma^{1-2\alpha}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}\right)\right|dX+2\int\left|\partial^2_{kk}uP_0u\right|\sigma^{1-2\alpha}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX\\ &+2\int\left|\partial_k g^{ij}\left(x,a\right)\partial_j u\partial^2_{ik}u\right|\sigma^{1-2\alpha}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX-\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\partial_k u\left(x,a\right)\right)^2\sigma^{1-2\alpha}\left(a\right)e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4a}}dx\ ,\end{aligned}$$

where $P_0^*=\partial_j\left(g^{ij}\left(x,a\right)\partial_i u\left(x,s\right)\right)-\partial_s u\left(x,s\right)$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|P_0^*\left(\sigma^{1-2\alpha}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}\right)\right| &= \left|P_0^*\left(\left(\sigma^{1-2\alpha}s^{n/2}\right)\left(s^{-n/2}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}\right)\right)\right| \\ &\leq C\left(\left(\frac{|x|}{s}+\frac{|x|^3}{s^2}\right)\sigma^{1-2\alpha}+\alpha\sigma^{-2\alpha}\right)e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left|\nabla_x\left(\sigma^{1-2\alpha}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}\right)\right| \leq C'\frac{|x|}{s}\sigma^{1-2\alpha}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}\ ,$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only and C' is an absolute constant.
By the above inequalities and (3.110) we get

$$\int \left|D^2u\right|^2\sigma^{1-2\alpha}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX \leq C\alpha\int\sigma^{-2\alpha}\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX \tag{3.111}$$

$$+C\int\left(\frac{|x|}{s}+\frac{|x|^3}{s^2}\right)\sigma^{1-2\alpha}\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX+C\int\frac{|x|}{s}\sigma^{1-2\alpha}\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g\left|P_0u\right|e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX$$

$$+C\int\left|D^2u\right|\left|P_0u\right|\sigma^{1-2\alpha}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX+C\int\left|D^2u\right|\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g\sigma^{1-2\alpha}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX$$

$$-\sum_{k=1}^n\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\sigma^{1-2\alpha}(a)\left(\partial_k u(x,a)\right)^2e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4a}}dx = I^{(1)}+I^{(2)}+I^{(3)}+I^{(4)}+I^{(5)}-\mathcal{B}_2\ ,$$

(here $\left|D^2u\right|^2=\sum\limits_{i,j=1}^n\left(\partial_{ij}^2u\right)^2$) where C depends on λ and Λ only.
By the trivial inequality $\dfrac{\theta(s)}{s}\geq\dfrac{1}{C}$, for every $s\in\left(0,\dfrac{1}{2}\right]$, $C\geq 1$, we have $C\delta^2\dfrac{\theta(\gamma s)}{s}\geq\alpha$, whenever $0<\gamma s\leq\dfrac{1}{2}$. By the last inequality and (3.71) we have

$$I^{(1)}\leq C\delta^2\int s\theta(\gamma s)\sigma^{-2-2\alpha}\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX\ , \tag{3.112}$$

for every $\alpha\geq 1$, $u\in C_0^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^n\times[a,+\infty)\right)$ such that $supp\, u\subset B_1\times\left[a,\frac{1}{2\gamma}\right)$, where C depends on λ and Λ only.
To estimate $I^{(2)}$ we observe that (3.69) gives $\sigma(s)\leq\dfrac{C}{\gamma}$, whenever $0<\gamma s\leq 1$.
By this inequality, (3.71) and Lemma 3.2.2 we have

$$I^{(2)}\leq\frac{C}{\gamma}\int\left(|x|+\frac{|x|^3}{s}\right)\sigma^{-1-2\alpha}\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX \tag{3.113}$$

$$\leq\frac{C}{\gamma}\left(e^{C_0}\gamma\right)^{2\alpha+\frac{3}{2}}\int s\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2dX+C\delta^3\int s\theta(\gamma s)\sigma^{-2-2\alpha}\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX$$

for every $\alpha \geq 1$, $u \in C_0^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^n \times [a, +\infty)\right)$ such that $supp\, u \subset B_1 \times \left[a, \frac{1}{2\gamma}\right)$, where C depends on λ and Λ only.

In order to estimate $I^{(3)}$, $I^{(4)}$ and $I^{(5)}$ we use the inequalities $2ab \leq a^2 + b^2$, $\sigma(s) \leq \dfrac{C}{\gamma}$, $s \leq \theta(\gamma s)$, when $0 < \gamma s \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and Lemma 3.2.2 and we obtain, for every $\alpha \geq 1$, $u \in C_0^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^n \times [a, +\infty)\right)$ such that $supp\, u \subset B_1 \times \left[a, \frac{1}{2\gamma}\right)$

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(3)} \quad &\leq \quad C\left(e^{C_0}\gamma\right)^{2\alpha+1} \int s \left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2 dX \\ &+ C\delta^2 \int s\theta(\gamma s)\, \sigma^{-2-2\alpha} \left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}} dX \\ &+ C\delta^2 \int s^2 \sigma^{-2-2\alpha} \left|P_0 u\right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}} dX, \end{aligned} \tag{3.114}$$

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(4)} \quad &\leq \quad \frac{1}{4} \int \left|D^2 u\right|^2 \sigma^{1-2\alpha} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}} dX \\ &+ C\delta^2 \int s^2 \sigma^{-2-2\alpha} \left|P_0 u\right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}} dX\ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.115}$$

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(5)} \quad &\leq \quad \frac{1}{4} \int \left|D^2 u\right|^2 \sigma^{1-2\alpha} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}} dX \\ &+ C\delta^2 \int s\theta(\gamma s)\, \sigma^{-2-2\alpha} \left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}} dX\ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.116}$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only.
By (3.111)-(3.116) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2\delta^2} \int \left|D^2 u\right|^2 \sigma^{1-2\alpha} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}} dX \leq \frac{C}{\delta^2} \left(e^{C_0}\gamma\right)^{2\alpha+\frac{3}{2}} \int s \left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2 dX \\ &+ C \int s\theta(\gamma s)\, \sigma^{-2-2\alpha} \left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}} dX + C \int s^2 \sigma^{-2-2\alpha} \left|P_0 u\right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}} dX\ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.117}$$

for every $\alpha \geq 1$, $u \in C_0^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^n \times [a, +\infty)\right)$ such that $supp\, u \subset B_1 \times \left[a, \frac{1}{2\gamma}\right)$, where C depends on λ and Λ only.
Now, by the inequality

$$\left|P_0 u\right| \leq \left|P u\right| + C\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g + C\sqrt{s}\left|D^2 u\right|\ ,$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only and by (3.109) and (3.117) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{B}_1 + \frac{1}{C\delta^2} \int \left|D^2 u\right|^2 \sigma^{1-2\alpha} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}} dX \\ &+ \frac{1}{C} \int s\theta(\gamma s)\, \sigma^{-2-2\alpha} \left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}} dX + \frac{(\alpha+1)}{C} \int \theta(\gamma s)\, \sigma^{-2-2\alpha} u^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}} dX \end{aligned} \tag{3.118}$$

$$\leq \frac{C}{\delta^2}\left(e^{C_0}\gamma\right)^{2\alpha+\frac{5}{2}}\int\left(u^2+s\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2\right)dX+C\int s^2\sigma^{-2-2\alpha}\left|Pu\right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX$$

$$C\int\left|D^2u\right|^2\sigma^{1-2\alpha}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX+C\int s^2\sigma^{-2-2\alpha}\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX\ ,$$

for every $\alpha \geq 1$, $u \in C_0^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^n \times [a,+\infty)\right)$ such that $supp\, u \subset B_1 \times \left[a, \frac{1}{2\gamma}\right)$, where C, $C \geq 1$, depends on λ and Λ only.
Observing that $\theta\left(\gamma s\right) \geq \dfrac{\gamma s}{C}$, whenever $0 < \gamma s \leq \dfrac{1}{2}$, we obtain that, if δ is small enough and $\alpha \geq 1$, the third and the fourth term at the right-hand side of (3.118) are absorbed by the second and the third term at the left-hand side of (3.118). Therefore there exists $\delta_1 \in (0, \delta_0]$ such that for every $\delta \in (0, \delta_1]$, $\alpha \geq 1$ and $u \in C_0^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^n \times [a,+\infty)\right)$ such that $suppu \subset B_1 \times \left[a, \frac{1}{2\gamma}\right)$, the following inequality holds true

$$\frac{1}{C}\int s\theta\left(\gamma s\right)\sigma^{-2-2\alpha}\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX \tag{3.119}$$

$$+\frac{(\alpha+1)}{C}\int\theta\left(\gamma s\right)\sigma^{-2-2\alpha}u^2e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX$$

$$\leq \frac{C}{\delta^2}\left(e^{C_0}\gamma\right)^{2\alpha+2}\int\left(u^2+s\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2\right)dX+C\int s^2\sigma^{-2-2\alpha}\left|Pu\right|^2e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}dX-\mathcal{B}_1\ ,$$

where $C \geq 1$ depends on λ and Λ only.

Now for a fixed $\delta \in (0, \delta_1]$ and $a \in \left(0, \dfrac{1}{4\gamma}\right]$ we estimate from above the term $-\mathcal{B}_1$ at the right-hand side of (3.119).
We have

$$\begin{aligned}-\mathcal{B}_1 &= -a^2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left|\left(\nabla_g u\right)(x,a)+\left(\nabla_g\phi\right)(x,a)\,u\left(x,a\right)\right|_{g(.,a)}^2 e^{2\phi(x,a)}dx\\ &\quad +a^2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\left|\left(\nabla_g\phi\right)(x,a)\right|_{g(.,a)}^2-\partial_s\phi\left(x,a\right)-\frac{1}{2a}\right)u^2\left(x,a\right)e^{2\phi(x,a)}dx\ .\end{aligned}$$

Let $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ be a number that we shall choose later. We get

$$\begin{aligned}-\mathcal{B}_1 &\leq -\varepsilon a^2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left|\left(\nabla_g u\right)(x,a)\right|_{g(.,a)}^2 e^{2\phi(x,a)}dx\\ &\quad +a^2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\left|\left(\nabla_g\phi\right)(x,a)\right|_{g(.,a)}^2-\partial_s\phi\left(x,a\right)-\frac{1}{2a}\right)u^2\left(x,a\right)e^{2\phi(x,a)}dx.\end{aligned}$$

Denote by $\eta_0 = \min\left\{1, \frac{1}{2\Lambda}\right\}$. Let us choose $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{4}$, we have, for every $x \in B_{\eta_0}$,

$$\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\left|\left(\nabla_g\phi\right)(x,a)\right|_{g(.,a)}^2-\partial_s\phi\left(x,a\right)-\frac{1}{2a}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{3}\left(2\Lambda\left|x\right|-1\right)\frac{\left|x\right|^2}{8a^2}+\frac{\left(\alpha+1\right)\sigma'\left(a\right)}{\sigma\left(a\right)} \leq \frac{\left(\alpha+1\right)}{e^{C_0}\sigma\left(a\right)}.$$

Therefore

$$-\mathcal{B}_1 \leq -\frac{a^2}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |(\nabla_g)(x,a)|^2_{g(.,a)} e^{2\phi(x,a)}dx + \frac{(\alpha+1)\,a^2}{e^{C_0}\sigma(a)}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u^2(x,a)\,e^{2\phi(x,a)}dx\ .$$

for every $\delta \in (0,\delta_1]$, $a \in \left(0, \frac{1}{4\gamma}\right]$, $\alpha \geq 1$ and $u \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [a,+\infty))$ such that $suppu \subset B_{\eta_0} \times \left[a, \frac{1}{2\gamma}\right)$. This inequality and (3.119) give (3.75).■

3.3 Two-sphere one-cylinder inequalities

In the present section and in the next two sections we shall prove some quantitative estimates of unique continuation for the forward parabolic operator

$$Lu = \partial_i\left(g^{ij}(x,t)\,\partial_j u\right) - \partial_t u\ . \tag{3.120}$$

Since such estimates are consequence of Theorem 3.2.3, for the sake of simplicity it is better to present their proofs in terms of the "backward" parabolic operators (3.62). On the contrary, since in the applications to the stability of the inverse problem of Section 4 we shall use the quantitative estimates of unique continuation for the "forward" operator (3.120), we state such estimates with the forward notation.

In order to prove next lemma we need some properties of the fundamental solution $\Gamma(x,s;y,\tau)$ of the adjoint operator $P^* = \partial_i\left(g^{ij}(x,s)\,\partial_j u\right) - \partial_s u$ of operator P appearing in (3.62). We refer to [16] for the definition and the proofs of the properties of function $\Gamma(x,s;y,\tau)$. In what follows we recall some properties of $\Gamma(x,s;y,\tau)$ that we shall use later on.
i) For every $(y,\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, the function $\Gamma(.,.;y,\tau)$ is a solution to the equation

$$P^*\left(\Gamma(.,.;y,\tau)\right) = 0\ ,\ \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (\tau,+\infty)\ . \tag{3.121}$$

ii) For every $(x,s),(y,\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ such that $(x,s) \neq (y,\tau)$ we have

$$\Gamma(x,s;y,\tau) \geq 0 \tag{3.122}$$

and

$$\Gamma(x,s;y,\tau) = 0\ ,\ \text{for every } s < \tau\ . \tag{3.123}$$

iii) There exists a constant $C > 1$ depending on λ (and n) only such that, for every $(x,s),(y,\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $s > \tau$ we have

$$\frac{C^{-1}}{(s-\tau)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{C|x-y|^2}{(s-\tau)}} \leq \Gamma(x,s;y,\tau) \leq \frac{C}{(s-\tau)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{C(s-\tau)}}\ . \tag{3.124}$$

iv) If u_0 is a function on $\mathbb{R}^n$ continuous at a point $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ which satisfies $e^{-\mu|x|^2}u_0 \in L^2\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right)$, for a positive number μ, then

$$\lim_{s\to 0^+}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Gamma(x,s;y,0)\,u_0(x)\,dx = u_0(y)\ . \tag{3.125}$$

Moreover by standard regularity results [104], [111] we have that, by (3.63) and (3.64), for every $(y,\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ the function $\Gamma(.,.;y,\tau)$ belongs to $H^{2,1}_{loc}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \smallsetminus \{(y,\tau)\}\right)$.

Lemma 3.3.1 *Let P be operator (3.62) whose coefficients satisfy (3.63) and (3.64). Assume that $u \in H^{2,1}(B_1 \times (0,1))$ satisfies the inequality*

$$|Pu| \leq \Lambda (|\nabla u| + |u|) \ , \textit{ in } B_1 \times [0,1) \ . \tag{3.126}$$

Then there exists a constant C, $C > 1$, depending on λ and Λ only such that for every $\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2, T \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right]$ satisfying $\rho_0 < \rho_1 < \rho_2$ the following inequality holds true

$$\int_{B_{\rho_2}} u^2(x,s)\, dx \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_{B_{\rho_0}} u^2(x,0)\, dx \ , \textit{ for every } s \in [0, s_0] \ , \tag{3.127}$$

where

$$s_0 = \min \left\{ T, \frac{(\rho_1 - \rho_0)^2}{C} \left[\left(\log \left(\widetilde{C} N(u) \right) \right)_+ \right]^{-1} \right\} \ , \tag{3.128}$$

(here $x_+ = \max\{x, 0\}$),

$$N(u) = \frac{\int_{B_{\rho_2} \times (0,2T)} u^2 dX}{\int_{B_{\rho_0}} u^2(x,0)\, dx} \ , \tag{3.129}$$

and

$$\widetilde{C} = \frac{C\left(\rho_2^n - \rho_1^n\right) \rho_0^n}{T(\rho_1 - \rho_0)^{n-1} (\rho_2 - \rho_1)^2} \ . \tag{3.130}$$

Proof. Let ρ_1, ρ_2 satisfy $0 < \rho_1 < \rho_2 \leq 1$ and let φ be a function belonging to $C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and satisfying $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\varphi = 1$ in B_{ρ_1}, $\varphi = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\rho_2}$ and

$$(\rho_2 - \rho_1) |\nabla \varphi| + (\rho_2 - \rho_1)^2 \left| D^2 \varphi \right| \leq C \ , \text{ in } B_{\rho_2} \setminus B_{\rho_1} \ , \tag{3.131}$$

where C is an absolute constant.

Denote

$$v(x,t) = u(x,t)\, \varphi(x) \, .$$

By (3.63), (3.64), (3.126) and (3.131) we have

$$|Pv| \leq C \left(|\nabla v| + |v| + E \chi_{B_{\rho_2} \setminus B_{\rho_1}} \right) \ , \tag{3.132}$$

where

$$E = (\rho_2 - \rho_1)^{-2} \|u\|_{L^\infty\left(B_{\rho_2} \times (0,T)\right)} + (\rho_2 - \rho_1)^{-1} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty\left(B_{\rho_2} \times (0,T)\right)} \ , \tag{3.133}$$

where $\chi_{B_{\rho_2} \backslash B_{\rho_1}}$ is the characteristic function of $B_{\rho_2} \setminus B_{\rho_1}$ and C depends on λ and Λ only.

Now, let $\rho_0 \in (0, \rho_1)$ and let y be a fixed point of B_{ρ_0} and denote by

$$H(s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^2(x,s)\, \Gamma(x,s;y,0)\, dx \ , \ s > 0 \ . \tag{3.134}$$

By differentiating H we get

$$\frac{dH(s)}{ds} = 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \partial_s v(x,s)\, v(x,s)\, \Gamma(x,s;y,0)\,dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^2(x,s)\, \partial_s \Gamma(x,s;y,0)\,dx \tag{3.135}$$

$$= 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (Pv(x,s))\, v(x,s)\, \Gamma(x,s;y,0)\,dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^2(x,s)\, v(x,s)\, \partial_s \Gamma(x,s;y,0)\,dx$$

$$-2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\Delta_g v)(x,s)\, v(x,s)\, \Gamma(x,s;y,0)\,dx.$$

By the identity $2(\Delta_g v)\, v = \Delta_g\left(v^2\right) - 2\left|\nabla_g v\right|_g^2$ and integrating by parts we obtain

$$2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\Delta_g v)(x,s)\, v(x,s)\, \Gamma(x,s;y,0)\,dx$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^2(x,s)\, \Delta_g \Gamma(x,s;y,0)\,dx - 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left|\nabla_g v(x,s)\right|_g^2 \Gamma(x,s;y,0)\,dx.$$

By plugging the just obtained identity at the right-hand side of (3.135) and by using (3.121) we have

$$\frac{dH(s)}{ds} = 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (Pv(x,s))\, v(x,s)\, \Gamma(x,s;y,0)\,dx + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left|\nabla_g v(x,s)\right|_g^2 \Gamma(x,s;y,0)\,dx\ . \tag{3.136}$$

By using (3.132) in the identity (3.136) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dH(s)}{ds} \quad \geq \quad & +2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left|\nabla_g v(x,s)\right|_g^2 \Gamma(x,s;y,0)\,dx \\ & -C\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v(x,s)| \left(\left|\nabla_g v(x,s)\right|_g + |v(x,s)| + E\chi_{B_{\rho_2}\setminus B_{\rho_1}}\right) \Gamma(x,s;y,0)\,dx, \end{aligned} \tag{3.137}$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only.

By using the inequality $2ab \leq \dfrac{a^2}{\varepsilon} + \varepsilon b^2$ to estimate from below the right-hand side of (3.137), we have

$$\frac{dH(s)}{ds} \geq -CH(s) - E^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \chi_{B_{\rho_2}\setminus B_{\rho_1}} \Gamma(x,s;y,0)\,dx\ , \tag{3.138}$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only.

Since $y \in B_{\rho_0}$, by (3.124) and (3.138) we have

$$\frac{dH(s)}{ds} \geq -CH(s) - C_1 E^2 \left(\rho_2^n - \rho_1^n\right) \frac{e^{-\frac{(\rho_1-\rho_0)^2}{4C_1 s}}}{s^{n/2}}\ , \tag{3.139}$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only and C_1 depends on λ only.

Now let us multiply both sides of (3.139) by e^{Cs} and integrate the obtained inequality. We get, for every $\varepsilon \in (0,T)$ and $s \in [\varepsilon, T]$,

$$H(s)\, e^{Cs} \geq H(\varepsilon)\, e^{C\varepsilon} - C_1 E^2 \left(\rho_2^n - \rho_1^n\right) \int_\varepsilon^s \frac{e^{C\tau - \frac{(\rho_1-\rho_0)^2}{4C_1 \tau}}}{\tau^{n/2}}\,d\tau\ . \tag{3.140}$$

By using (3.125) and passing to the limit as ε tends to 0 in the inequality (3.140), we get

$$\begin{aligned} H(s)\,e^{Cs} &\geq u^2(y,0) - C_1E^2\left(\rho_2^n-\rho_1^n\right)\int_\varepsilon^s \frac{e^{C\tau-\frac{(\rho_1-\rho_0)^2}{4C_1\tau}}}{\tau^{n/2}}d\tau \\ &\geq u^2(y,0) - C_1E^2\frac{\left(\rho_2^n-\rho_1^n\right)}{\left(\rho_1-\rho_0\right)^{n-1}}e^{-\frac{(\rho_1-\rho_0)^2}{8C_1s}}\ \text{, for every } s\in(0,T_0]\ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.141}$$

where $T_0=\min\left\{\frac{(\rho_1-\rho_0)^2}{16C_1},T\right\}$ and C_1 depend on λ only.
Now, integrating over B_{ρ_0} the inequality (3.141) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_{\rho_0}}dy\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}v^2(x,s)\,\Gamma(x,s;y,0)\,dx \\ \geq\ & \frac{1}{C}\left(\int_{B_{\rho_0}}u^2(y,0)\,dy - CE^2\frac{\left(\rho_2^n-\rho_1^n\right)\rho_0^n}{\left(\rho_1-\rho_0\right)^{n-1}}e^{-\frac{(\rho_1-\rho_0)^2}{Cs}}\right)\ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.142}$$

where C, $C>1$, depends on λ and Λ only.
On the other hand, by (3.124) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_{\rho_0}}dy\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}v^2(x,s)\,\Gamma(x,s;y,0)\,dx \\ \leq\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left(v^2(x,s)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\frac{Ce^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4Cs}}}{s^{n/2}}dy\right)dx \leq C'\int_{B_{\rho_2}}u^2(x,s)\,dx \end{aligned} \tag{3.143}$$

and by standard regularity estimates we have

$$E^2\leq\frac{C}{\left(\rho_2-\rho_1\right)^2}\frac{1}{\rho_2T}\int_{B_{\rho_2}\times(0,2T)}u^2dX\ , \tag{3.144}$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only.
By (3.142), (3.143) and (3.144) we obtain, for every $s\in(0,T_0]$,

$$\int_{B_{\rho_2}}u^2(x,s)\,dx\geq\frac{1}{C}\int_{B_{\rho_0}}u^2(x,0)\,dx - C_3e^{-\frac{(\rho_1-\rho_0)^2}{Cs}}\int_{B_{\rho_2}\times(0,2T)}u^2dX, \tag{3.145}$$

where

$$C_3=\frac{C\left(\rho_2^n-\rho_1^n\right)\rho_0^n}{T\left(\rho_1-\rho_0\right)^{n-1}\left(\rho_2-\rho_1\right)^2}$$

and C, $C>1$, depends on λ and Λ only. By (3.145) we get (3.127).■

Now let us introduce a notation which we shall use in Lemma 3.3.2 and in Theorem 3.3.3 below.

Let $\alpha\geq1$, $a\geq0$, $k\geq0$, $\rho>0$ be given numbers. Denote

$$D_\rho^{(a)}=\left\{(x,s)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times(0,+\infty):\frac{|x|^2}{4\alpha(s+a)}+\log(s+a)\leq\log\frac{\rho^2}{4\alpha}\right\} \tag{3.146}$$

and, for $\rho > (4\alpha a)^{1/2}$,

$$L_\rho^{(a)} = \sup\left\{ (s+a)^{-(\alpha+k)} \, e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}} : (x,s) \in D_{2\rho}^{(a)} \setminus D_\rho^{(a)} \right\} . \tag{3.147}$$

Lemma 3.3.2 *For any positive numbers α, a, k and $\rho > 0$ such that $\alpha \geq 1$ and $\rho > (4\alpha a)^{1/2}$ we have*

$$L_\rho^{(a)} \leq c_k 4^\alpha \left(\frac{\alpha}{\rho^2}\right)^{\alpha+k} , \tag{3.148}$$

where c_k depends on k only.

Proof. First notice that $L_\rho^{(a)} \leq L_\rho^{(0)}$ for every $a \geq 0$, hence it is enough to prove (3.148) for $a = 0$.

Now, for any fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the function $s \rightarrow s^{-\alpha-k} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4s}}$ attains the maximum when $s = \frac{|x|^2}{4(\alpha+k)}$. Therefore in order to estimate $L_\rho^{(0)}$ from above we need to consider the intersction Γ of the paraboloid $\left\{(x,s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : s = \frac{|x|^2}{4(\alpha+k)}\right\}$ with the set $D_{2\rho}^{(a)} \setminus D_\rho^{(a)}$. It is easy to check that the projection of Γ on the s-axis is equal to the interval $I = \left(\frac{\rho^2}{4\alpha e^{1+(k/\alpha)}}, \frac{(2\rho)^2}{4\alpha e^{1+(k/\alpha)}}\right]$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} L_\rho^{(0)} &= \sup\left\{ s^{-\alpha-k} e^{-\alpha-k} : s \in I \right\} \\ &\leq e^{k(k+1)} \left(4\alpha\rho^{-2}\right)^{\alpha+k} . \end{aligned}$$

■

Theorem 3.3.3 ***(two-sphere one-cylinder inequality in the interior).*** *Let λ, Λ and R be positive numbers, with $\lambda \in (0,1]$ and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Let L be the parabolic operator*

$$L = \partial_i \left(g^{ij}(x,t)\, \partial_j\right) - \partial_t \ ,$$

where $\left\{g^{ij}(x,t)\right\}_{i,j=1}^n$ is a real symmetric $n \times n$ matrix. When $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $(x,t), (y,\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ assume that

$$\lambda |\xi|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^n g^{ij}(x,t)\, \xi_i \xi_j \leq \lambda^{-1} |\xi|^2 \tag{3.149}$$

and

$$\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^n \left(g^{ij}(x,t) - g^{ij}(y,\tau)\right)^2\right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{\Lambda}{R} \left(|x-y|^2 + |t-\tau|\right)^{1/2} . \tag{3.150}$$

Let u be a function belonging to $H^{2,1}\left(B_R \times \left(t_0 - R^2, t_0\right)\right)$ which satisfies the inequality

$$|Lu| \leq \Lambda \left(\frac{|\nabla u|}{R} + \frac{|u|}{R^2} \right) \ , \textit{ in } B_R \times \left(t_0 - R^2, t_0\right] \ . \tag{3.151}$$

Then there exist constants $\eta_1 \in (0,1)$ and C, $C \geq 1$, depending on λ and Λ only such that for every r and ρ such that $0 < r \leq \rho \leq \eta_1 R$ we have

$$\int_{B_\rho} u^2\left(x, t_0\right) dx \leq \frac{CR}{\rho} \left(R^{-2} \int_{B_R \times (t_0 - R^2, t_0)} u^2 dX \right)^{1-\theta_1} \left(\int_{B_r} u^2\left(x, t_0\right) dx \ \right)^{\theta_1} , \tag{3.152}$$

where

$$\theta_1 = \frac{1}{C \log \frac{R}{r}} \ . \tag{3.153}$$

Proof. Denoting $\widetilde{u}\left(x,s\right) = u\left(x, t_0 - s\right)$, $\widetilde{g}^{-1}\left(x,s\right) = g^{-1}\left(x, t_0 - s\right)$, $P = \partial_i\left(\widetilde{g}^{ij}\left(x,s\right)\partial_j\right) + \partial_s$, by (3.151) it turns out that $\widetilde{u}$ belongs to $H^{2,1}\left(B_R \times \left(0, R^2\right)\right)$ and satisfies the differential inequality

$$|P\widetilde{u}| \leq \Lambda \left(\frac{|\nabla \widetilde{u}|}{R} + \frac{|\widetilde{u}|}{R^2} \right) \ , \text{in } B_R \times \left[0, R^2\right) .$$

By scaling we have that inequality (3.152) is equivalent to

$$\int\limits_{B_\rho} \widetilde{u}^2\left(x,0\right) dx \leq \frac{C}{\rho} \left(\int\limits_{B_1 \times (0,1)} \widetilde{u}^2 dX \right)^{1-\theta_1} \left(\int\limits_{B_r} \widetilde{u}^2\left(x,0\right) dx \ \right)^{\theta_1} \ ,$$

where $\theta_1 = \frac{1}{C \log \frac{1}{r}}$. In what follows we drop the sign ”$\sim$” over u and the matrix g^{-1}. First we consider the case $g^{ij}\left(0,0\right) = \delta^{ij}$ and we write the Carleman estimate (3.75) in a slight different form which is more suitable for our purposes. It is easy to check that, by (3.71) and by $C\delta^2 \dfrac{\theta\left(\gamma s\right)}{s} \geq \alpha$, whenever $0 < \gamma s \leq \dfrac{1}{2}$ and by (3.75), we have

$$\alpha^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+} \sigma_a^{-\alpha} u^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}} dX + \alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+} \sigma_a^{-\alpha} \left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}} dX \tag{3.154}$$

$$\leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+} \left(s+a\right)^2 \sigma_a^{1-\alpha} \left|Pu\right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}} dX + C^\alpha \alpha^\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+} \left(u^2 + \left(s+a\right) \left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2 \right) dX$$

$$+ C\alpha\sigma^{-\alpha}\left(a\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u^2\left(x,0\right) e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4a}} dx \ .$$

for every $\alpha \geq 2$, $0 < a \leq \dfrac{T_1}{\alpha}$ and $u \in C_0^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, +\infty)\right)$ such that *supp* $u \subset B_{\eta_0} \times \left[0, \dfrac{3T_1}{\alpha}\right)$, where $T_1 = \dfrac{\delta_1^2}{3}$, and η_0, $\eta_0 \in (0,1)$, C, $C > 1$, depend on λ and Λ only (recall that η_0 is defined in Theorem 3.2.3).

By using Friedrichs density theorem we can apply Carleman estimate (3.154) to the function $v = u\varphi$, where φ is a function belonging to $C_0^\infty\left(B_{\eta_0}\times\left[0,\dfrac{3T_1}{\alpha}\right)\right)$ that we are going to define.

Let $\overline{R}_0 = \min\left\{\sqrt{T_1}, \sqrt{e}\eta_0\right\}$, $R_1 \in \left(0, \overline{R}_0\right]$. For any $\alpha \geq 2$ denote

$$d_1 = \log\frac{(R_1/2)^2}{4\alpha}\ ,\ d_2 = \log\frac{R_1^2}{4\alpha}\ .$$

Let ψ_1 be the function which is equal to 0 in $\mathbb{R}\setminus[d_1,d_2]$ and such that $\psi_1(\tau) = \exp\frac{(d_2-d_1)^2}{(d_1-\tau)(\tau-d_2)}$, if $\tau\in(d_1,d_2)$. Denote by ψ_2 the function such that

$$\psi_2(\tau) = \frac{\int_\tau^{d_2}\psi_1(\xi)\,d\xi}{\int_{d_1}^{d_2}\psi_1(\xi)\,d\xi}\ ,\ \text{if } \tau\in\mathbb{R}\ .$$

It is easy to check that $\psi_2(\tau) = 1$, for every $\tau\in(-\infty,d_1)$, $\psi_2(\tau) = 0$, for every $\tau\in(d_2,+\infty)$ and

$$|\psi_2'(\tau)| \leq \frac{C}{d_2-d_1}\ ,\ |\psi_2''(\tau)| \leq \frac{C}{(d_2-d_1)^2},\ \text{if } \tau\in[d_1,d_2]\ , \tag{3.155}$$

where C is an absolute constant. Notice that the right-hand side of inequalities does not depend on α and R_1.

Now, let us define

$$\varphi(x,s) = \psi_2\left(\frac{|x|^2}{4\alpha(s+a)} + \log(s+a)\right)\ , \tag{3.156}$$

for every $a\in\left(0,\dfrac{T_1}{\alpha}\right]$ and $\alpha\geq 2$.

It is easy to check that $\varphi\in C_0^\infty\left(B_{\eta_0}\times\left[0,\dfrac{3T_1}{\alpha}\right)\right)$, $\varphi = 1$ for every $(x,s)\in D_{R_1/2}^{(a)}$ and $\varphi = 0$ for every $(x,s)\in\left(B_{\eta_0}\times\left[0,\dfrac{3T_1}{\alpha}\right)\right)\setminus D_{R_1}^{(a)}$. Moreover by (3.151) we have that the function $v = u\varphi$ satisfies the inequality

$$|Pv| \leq \Lambda(|\nabla u| + |u|)\chi_{D_{R_1}^{(a)}} + C\left(\frac{|x|\,|\nabla_g u|_g}{\alpha(s+a)} + \frac{|u|}{(s+a)^2}\right)\chi_{D_{R_1}^{(a)}\setminus D_{R_1/2}^{(a)}}\ , \tag{3.157}$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only.

Now we apply inequality (3.154) to the function v. By (3.157) we obtain, for every $\alpha\geq 2$,

$$\alpha^2\int_{D_{R_1/2}^{(a)}}\sigma_a^{-\alpha}u^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}}dX + \alpha\int_{D_{R_1/2}^{(a)}}\sigma_a^{-\alpha}|\nabla_g u|_g^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}}dX \tag{3.158}$$

$$\leq C\int_{D^{(a)}_{R_1/2}}\sigma_a^{1-\alpha}u^2e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}}dX+C\int_{D^{(a)}_{R_1/2}}\sigma_a^{1-\alpha}\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}}dX$$

$$+C\int_{D^{(a)}_{R_1}\setminus D^{(a)}_{R_1/2}}\sigma_a^{1-\alpha}\left(\frac{|x|^2\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2}{\alpha^2\left(s+a\right)^2}+\frac{u^2}{\left(s+a\right)^4}\right)e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}}dX+I\ ,$$

where

$$I=C^\alpha\alpha^\alpha\int_{D^{(a)}_{R_1/2}}\left\{\left(\frac{|x|^2}{\alpha^2\left(s+a\right)^2}+1\right)u^2+\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2\right\}dX \tag{3.159}$$

$$+C\alpha\left(\sigma\left(a\right)\right)^{-\alpha}\int_{B_1}v^2\left(x,0\right)e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4a}}dx$$

and C, $C>1$, depends on λ and Λ only.
Now, for α large enough, the first and the second integral at the right-hand side of (3.158) obtained above can be absorbed by the left-hand side of (3.158) and we have

$$\alpha^2\int_{D^{(a)}_{R_1/2}}\sigma_a^{-\alpha}u^2e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}}dX \tag{3.160}$$

$$\leq\ \ C\int_{D^{(a)}_{R_1}\setminus D^{(a)}_{R_1/2}}\sigma_a^{1-\alpha}\left(\frac{|x|^2\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2}{\alpha^2\left(s+a\right)^2}+\frac{u^2}{\left(s+a\right)^4}\right)e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}}dX+I\ ,$$

for every $\alpha\geq C$, where C depends on λ and Λ only.
In order to estimate from above the first integral at the right-hand side of (3.160) we use (3.71) and Lemma 3.3.2, so we get

$$\int_{D^{(a)}_{R_1}\setminus D^{(a)}_{R_1/2}}\sigma_a^{1-\alpha}\left(\frac{|x|^2\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2}{\alpha^2\left(s+a\right)^2}+\frac{u^2}{\left(s+a\right)^4}\right)e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}}dX \tag{3.161}$$

$$\leq\ \ C^\alpha\int_{D^{(a)}_{R_1}\setminus D^{(a)}_{R_1/2}}\left(s+a\right)^{-\alpha-3}\left(\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2+u^2\right)e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}}dX$$

$$\leq\ \ \frac{C'^\alpha\alpha^\alpha}{R_1^{2(\alpha+3)}}\int_{D^{(a)}_{R_1}\setminus D^{(a)}_{R_1/2}}\left(\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2+u^2\right)dX\ ,$$

for every $\alpha\geq C$ and every $a\in\left(0,\frac{R_1^2}{16\alpha}\right)$, where C, $C>1$, and C', $C'>1$, depend on λ and Λ only.
By the inequality obtained in (3.161) and by (3.160) we have

$$\alpha^2\int_{D^{(a)}_{R_1/2}}\sigma_a^{-\alpha}u^2e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}}dX \tag{3.162}$$

$$\leq\ \ \frac{C^\alpha\alpha^\alpha}{R_1^{2(\alpha+3)}}\int_{D^{(a)}_{R_1}\setminus D^{(a)}_{R_1/2}}\left(\left|\nabla_g u\right|_g^2+u^2\right)dX+I\ ,$$

for every $\alpha \geq C$ and every $a \in \left(0, \dfrac{R_1^2}{16\alpha}\right)$, where $C > 1$ depends on λ and Λ only.

Now we estimate from above the term I (defined in (3.159)) at the right-hand side of (3.162). Concerning the first integral at the right-hand side of formula (3.159) it is simple to check that

$$\int_{D_{R_1}^{(a)}} \left\{ \left(\frac{|x|^2}{\alpha^2 (s+a)^2} + 1 \right) u^2 + |\nabla_g u|_g^2 \right\} dX \tag{3.163}$$

$$\leq \quad C \|u\|^2_{L^\infty\left(D_{R_1}^{(a)}\right)} + \int_{D_{R_1}^{(a)}} |\nabla_g u|_g^2 \, dX \ ,$$

for every $\alpha \geq 1$, where C is an absolute constant. Concerning the second integral at the right-hand side of (3.159) we have

$$\int_{B_1} v^2(x,0)\, e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4a}} dx \leq \int_{B_{r(a)}} u^2(x,0)\, dx \ , \tag{3.164}$$

where

$$r(a) = \left(4\alpha a \log \frac{R_1^2}{4\alpha a} \right)^{1/2} \ .$$

By (3.162), (3.163) and (3.164) we have

$$\alpha^2 \int_{D_{R_1/2}^{(a)}} \sigma_a^{-\alpha} u^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+a)}} dX \tag{3.165}$$

$$\leq \frac{C^\alpha \alpha^\alpha}{R_1^{2(\alpha+3)}} \left(\|u\|^2_{L^\infty\left(D_{R_1}^{(a)}\right)} + \int_{D_{R_1}^{(a)}} |\nabla_g u|_g^2 \, dX \right) + \frac{C^\alpha}{a^\alpha} \int_{B_{r(a)}} u^2(x,0)\, dx \ ,$$

for every $\alpha \geq C$ and every $a \in \left(0, \dfrac{R_1^2}{16\alpha}\right)$, where C, $C > 1$, depends on λ and Λ only.

Let r be a number in the interval $\left(0, e^{-1/2}R_1\right)$ and, for every $\alpha \geq C$, let $\overline{a}$ belong to $\left(0, e^{-1}\dfrac{R_1^2}{4\alpha}\right)$ and such that

$$r(\overline{a}) = \left(4\alpha\overline{a} \log \frac{R_1^2}{4\alpha\overline{a}} \right)^{1/2} = r \ . \tag{3.166}$$

By asymptotic estimates of $\overline{a}$ we have

$$\frac{1}{4e\alpha} r^2 \left(\log \frac{R_1^2}{r^2} \right)^{-1} \leq \overline{a} \leq \frac{1}{4\alpha} r^2 \left(\log \frac{R_1^2}{r^2} \right)^{-1} \ . \tag{3.167}$$

Furthermore, using standard regularity estimates [111] we estimate from above the first and the second integral at the right-hand side of (3.165) and we get

$$\alpha^2 \int_{D_{R_1/2}^{(\overline{a})}} \sigma_{\overline{a}}^{-\alpha} u^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+\overline{a})}} dX \tag{3.168}$$

$$\leq \frac{C^{\alpha}\alpha^{\alpha}}{R_1^{2(\alpha+5)}} \int_{B_{R_1}\times\left(0,R_1^2\right)} u^2 dX + \frac{C^{\alpha}}{\overline{a}^{\alpha}} \int_{B_r} u^2\left(x,0\right)dx \ ,$$

for every $\alpha \geq C$, where C, $C > 1$, depends on λ and Λ only.
Now we estimate from below the left-hand side of (3.168). Let $\rho \in \left(0, \frac{R_1}{2}\right)$, by (3.71) we have

$$\int_{D^{(\overline{a})}_{R_1/2}} \sigma_{\overline{a}}^{-\alpha} u^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+\overline{a})}} dX \tag{3.169}$$

$$\geq \int_{D^{(\overline{a})}_{\rho}} \sigma_{\overline{a}}^{-\alpha} u^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(s+\overline{a})}} dX \geq \frac{1}{C^{\alpha}} \left(\frac{\rho^2}{4\alpha}\right)^{-\alpha} \int_{D^{(\overline{a})}_{\rho}} u^2 dX \ ,$$

where C, $C > 1$, depends on λ and Λ only. By the inequalities obtained in (3.167), (3.168) and (3.169) we have

$$\alpha^2 \int_{D^{(\overline{a})}_{\rho}} u^2 dX \leq \frac{\left(C\rho^2\right)^{\alpha}}{R_1^{2(\alpha+5)}} \int_{B_{R_1}\times\left(0,R_1^2\right)} u^2 dX \tag{3.170}$$

$$+ C^{\alpha}\rho^{2\alpha} \left(r^2\left(\log\frac{R_1^2}{r^2}\right)^{-1}\right)^{-\alpha} \int_{B_r} u^2\left(x,0\right)dx \ ,$$

for every $\alpha \geq C$, where C, $C > 1$, depends on λ and Λ only.
Denote

$$t_1 = \frac{\rho^2 e^{-1}}{8\alpha} - \overline{a} \ , \ t_2 = \frac{\rho^2 e^{-1}}{8\alpha}\left(1+e^{-1}\right) - \overline{a} \ ,$$

$$Q = B_{\frac{\rho}{2e^{1/2}}} \times \left(t_1, t_2\right) \ ,$$

$$E = \left(\int_{B_{R_1}\times\left(0,R_1^2\right)} u^2 dX\right)^{1/2} \ , \ \varepsilon = \left(\int_{B_r} u^2\left(x,0\right)dx\right)^{1/2} \ .$$

Observing that for every $\rho \in \left(\frac{r}{e^{1/2}}, \frac{R_1}{2}\right)$ we have $t_2 > t_1 > 0$ and $Q \subset D^{(\overline{a})}_{\rho}$, inequality (3.170) gives

$$\alpha^2 \int_Q u^2 dX \leq \frac{\left(C\rho\right)^{2\alpha}}{R_1^{2(\alpha+5)}} E^2 + \left(\frac{C\rho}{r\left(\log R_1^2/r^2\right)^{-1/2}}\right)^{2\alpha} \varepsilon^2 \ , \tag{3.171}$$

for every $\alpha \geq C$, where C, $C > 1$, depends on λ and Λ only.
In order to estimate from below the left-hand side of inequality (3.171) we apply Lemma 3.3.1. In doing so we choose $\rho_0 = \frac{e^{-1/2}\rho}{4}$, $\rho_1 = \frac{3e^{-1}\rho}{8}$, $\rho_2 = \frac{e^{-1/2}\rho}{2}$ and $T = \rho_2^2$. Let us denote

$$K = \left(\int_{B_{\rho_0}} u^2\left(x,0\right)dx\right)^{1/2} .$$

We have that there exists a constant C_0, $C_0>1$, depending on λ and Λ only such that if

$$\alpha \geq \alpha_0 := C_0 \max\left\{1, \log\left(\frac{\rho^{n-4}E^2}{K^2}\right)\right\} \tag{3.172}$$

then

$$\int_Q u^2 dX = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{B_{\rho_2}} u^2(x,t)\,dx \geq \frac{t_2-t_1}{C}\int_{B_{\rho_0}} u^2(x,0)\,dx = \frac{\rho^2}{8\alpha C}K^2 \ . \tag{3.173}$$

By inequality (3.171) and (3.173) we get

$$\rho^2 K^2 \leq \frac{(C\rho)^{2\alpha}}{R_1^{2(\alpha+5)}}E^2 + \left(\frac{C\rho}{r\left(\log R_1^2/r^2\right)^{-1/2}}\right)^{2\alpha}\varepsilon^2 \ , \tag{3.174}$$

for every $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ and every r, R_1, ρ satisfying the relations $R_1 \in \left(0, \overline{R}_0\right]$, $r \in \left(0, e^{-1/2}R_1\right]$, $\rho \in \left(e^{1/2}r, \frac{R_1}{2}\right]$, where $C>1$ depends on λ and Λ only.
Denote by

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{\log\left(E^2\varepsilon^{-2}\right)}{\log\left(R_1^2 r^{-2}\log\left(R_1^2 r^{-2}\right)\right)} \ .$$

the following cases occur: i) $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_0$, ii) $\alpha_1 < \alpha_0$. If case i) occurs then we choose in (3.174) $\alpha=\alpha_1$ and we have

$$\rho^2 K^2 \leq \frac{2}{R_1^{10}}E^{2(1-\theta_0)}\varepsilon^{2\theta_0} \ , \tag{3.175}$$

where

$$\theta_0 = \frac{\log\left(E^2\rho^{-2}/C\right)}{\log\left(R_1^2 r^{-2}\log\left(R^2 r^{-2}\right)\right)} \ , \tag{3.176}$$

where C, $C>1$, depends on λ and Λ only.
Now consider case ii). We have either

$$\alpha_0 = C_0 \log\left(\frac{\rho^{n-4}E^2}{K^2}\right) \geq C_0 \ , \tag{3.177}$$

or

$$\alpha_0 = C_0 \leq C_0 \log\left(\frac{\rho^{n-4}E^2}{K^2}\right) \ , \tag{3.178}$$

where C_0 is the same constant which appears in (3.172). Let us introduce the notation

$$\widetilde{\theta}_0 = \frac{1}{C_0 \log\left(R_1^2 r^{-2}\log\left(R_1^2 r^{-2}\right)\right)} \ , \ \theta_1 = \frac{1}{C_0 \log\frac{1}{r}}$$

If (3.177) occurs then, recalling that $\alpha_1 < \alpha$, we have trivially

$$\theta_1 \log\left(\frac{E^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \leq \log\left(\frac{\rho^{n-4}E^2}{K^2}\right) \ ,$$

hence

$$K^2 \leq E^{2\left(1-\widetilde{\theta}_0\right)}\varepsilon^{2\widetilde{\theta}_0} \ . \tag{3.179}$$

If (3.178) occurs then we have trivially

$$\widetilde{\theta}_0 \log\left(\frac{E^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \leq 1 \ ,$$

hence

$$E^{2\theta_1} \leq e\varepsilon^{2\theta_1} \ . \tag{3.180}$$

On the other side, by standard regularity estimates for parabolic equations we have

$$K^2 \leq \frac{C_1}{R_1^2}E^2 \ , \tag{3.181}$$

where C_1 depends on λ only. Therefore (3.180) and (3.181) yield

$$K^2 \leq \frac{C_1}{R_1^2}E^2 = \frac{C_1}{R_1^2}E^{2\left(1-\widetilde{\theta}_0\right)}E^{2\widetilde{\theta}_0} \leq \frac{C_1}{R_1^2}E^{2\left(1-\widetilde{\theta}_0\right)}\varepsilon^{2\widetilde{\theta}_0} \ . \tag{3.182}$$

Now there exists a constant C, $C>1$, depending on λ and Λ only such that if $\rho^2 \leq \frac{R_1^2}{e^{1/C}C}$ then we have $\widetilde{\theta}_0 \leq \theta_0$. Therefore by (3.175), (3.179), (3.181) and (3.182) we get

$$K^2 \leq \frac{C_2}{R_1^5\rho}E^{2\left(1-\widetilde{\theta}_0\right)}\varepsilon^{2\widetilde{\theta}_0} \ , \tag{3.183}$$

for every $R_1 \in \left(0, \overline{R}_0\right]$, $r \in \left(0, e^{-1/2}R_1\right]$, $\rho \in \left(e^{1/2}r, \dfrac{R_1}{Ce^{1/(2C)}}\right]$, where C_2, $C_2>1$, depends on λ only.

In the case $g^{ij}(0,0) \neq \delta^{ij}$ we can consider a linear transformation $S:\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $Sx = \left\{S^i_j x_j\right\}_{i=1}^n$, such that, denoting $\widetilde{g}^{ij}(y,t) = \frac{1}{|\det S|}S^i_k g^{kl}\left(S^{-1}y,t\right)S^j_l$ we have $\widetilde{g}^{ij}(0,0) = \delta^{ij}$ and

$$B_{\varrho/\sqrt{\lambda}} \subset S\left(B_\varrho\right) \subset B_{\sqrt{\lambda}\varrho} \ , \text{ for every } \varrho > 0.$$

Therefore, by a change of variables, by using the inequality (3.183) and the trivial inequality $r^2\left(\log\frac{1}{r^2}\right)^{-1} > r^3$, for every $r \in (0,1)$ the thesis follows.■

Corollary 3.3.4 ***(Spacelike strong unique continuation).*** *Let* $u \in H^{2,1}\left(B_R \times \left(t_0 - R^2, t_0\right)\right)$ *satisfy inequality (3.151).*
If for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ *we have*

$$\int_{B_r} u^2(x,t_0)\,dx = O\left(r^{2k}\right) \ , \text{ as } r \to 0, \tag{3.184}$$

then

$$u(.,t_0) = 0 \ , \text{ in } B_R \ .$$

Proof. Is the same of the proof of Corollary 3.1.7.■

In order to state the theorem below we need to introduce some new notations. Let E and R be positive numbers, $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function satisfying the conditions

$$\varphi(0,t_0) = |\nabla_{x'}\varphi(0,t_0)| = 0 \ , \tag{3.185}$$

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty\left(Q_R^{t_0\prime}\right)} + R\|\nabla_{x'}\varphi\|_{L^\infty\left(Q_R^{t_0\prime}\right)} + R^2\left\|D^2_{x'}\varphi\right\|_{L^\infty\left(Q_R^{t_0\prime}\right)} + R^2\|\partial_s\varphi\|_{L^\infty\left(Q_R^{t_0\prime}\right)} \le ER \ , \tag{3.186}$$

where $Q_R^{t_0\prime} = B'_R \times \left(t_0 - R^2, t_0\right]$.
For any numbers $\rho \in (0,R]$, $\tau \in \left(t_0 - R^2, t_0\right]$, denote by

$$Q^{t_0}_{\rho,\varphi} = \left\{(x,s) \in B_\rho \times \left(t_0 - \rho^2, t_0\right) : x_n > \varphi(x',s)\right\},$$

$$Q_{\rho,\varphi}(\tau) = \left\{x \in B_\rho : x_n > \varphi(x',\tau)\right\},$$

$$\Gamma^{t_0}_{\rho,\varphi} = \left\{(x,s) \in B_\rho \times \left(t_0 - \rho^2, t_0\right) : x_n = \varphi(x',s)\right\}.$$

Theorem 3.3.5 ***(two-sphere one-cylinder inequality at the boundary).*** *Let L be a second order parabolic operator as in Theorem 3.3.3. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function satisfying (3.185) and (3.186). Assume that $u \in H^{2,1}(Q_{R,\varphi})$ satisfies the inequality*

$$|Lu| \le \Lambda\left(\frac{|\nabla u|}{R} + \frac{|u|}{R^2}\right) \ , \ in\ Q_{R,\varphi} \tag{3.187}$$

and

$$u(x,t) = 0, \text{ for every } (x,t) \in \Gamma^{t_0}_{R,\varphi} \ . \tag{3.188}$$

Then there exist constants $\eta_2 \in (0,1)$ and C, $C > 1$, depending on λ, Λ and E only such that for every r, ρ, $0 < r \le \rho \le \eta_2 R$ we have

$$\int_{Q_{\rho,\varphi}(t_0)} u^2(x,t_0)\,dx \le \frac{CR^2}{\rho^2}\left(R^{-2}\int_{Q^{t_0}_{R,\varphi}} u^2 dX\right)^{1-\theta_2}\left(\int_{Q_{r,\varphi}(t_0)} u^2(x,t_0)\,dx\right)^{\theta_2} \ , \tag{3.189}$$

where

$$\theta_2 = \frac{1}{C\log\frac{R}{r}} \ . \tag{3.190}$$

For the sake of simplicity, here we give a proof of Theorem 3.3.5 with the following additional condition on the matrix $\left\{g^{ij}(x,t)\right\}_{i,j=1}^n$:

$$\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^n \left(g^{ij}(x,t) - g^{ij}(x,\tau)\right)^2\right)^{1/2} \le \frac{\Lambda}{R^2}|t-\tau| \ , \tag{3.191}$$

for every $(x,t), (x,\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

Actually the additional condition (3.191) is really used to prove Theorem 4.0.3 (the stability result for the inverse problem). An outline of the proof of Theorem 3.3.5 (without condition (3.191)) is given in [60].

We need the following proposition proved [142].

Proposition 3.3.6 *Let λ_0 and Λ_0 be positive numbers, with $\lambda_0 \in (0,1]$. Let $A(t)$ be a $n \times n$ symmetric real matrix whose entries are Lipschitz continuous in $\mathbb{R}$. Assume that*

$$\lambda_0 |\xi|^2 \leq A(t)\, \xi \cdot \xi \leq \lambda_0^{-1} |\xi|^2 \text{ , for every } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and } s \in \mathbb{R} \text{ ,} \tag{3.192}$$

$$\left| \frac{d}{ds} A(t) \right| \leq \Lambda_0, \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.193}$$

Denote by $\sqrt{A(t)}$ the positive square root of $A(t)$. We have

$$\left| \frac{d}{ds} \sqrt{A(t)} \right| \leq 2^{3/2} \lambda_0^{-7/2} \Lambda_0, \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.194}$$

Proof of Theorem 3.3.5 with condition (3.191)**.** Without loss of generality we assume that $t_0 = 0$. Let us introduce the following notations. Let $\psi_1 : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\Phi_1 : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be respectively the maps $\psi_1(y,\tau) = (y', y_n + \varphi(y',\tau))$ and $\Phi_1(y,\tau) = (\psi_1(y,\tau), \tau)$. We have $\Phi_1(y', 0, \tau) = (y', \varphi(y',\tau), \tau)$, for every $y' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, \tau \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, denoting $R_1 = \dfrac{R}{1+2E}$, by (3.186) we have

$$\Phi_1\left(B_1^+ \times \left(-R_1^2, 0\right]\right) \subset Q^0_{R,\varphi} \text{ .} \tag{3.195}$$

Denote

$$g_1^{-1}(y,\tau) = \left(\frac{\partial \psi_1(y,\tau)}{\partial y}\right)^{-1} g^{-1}(\Phi_1(y,\tau)) \left(\left(\frac{\partial \psi_1(y,\tau)}{\partial y}\right)^{-1}\right)^* \text{ ,}$$

(here $\frac{\partial \psi_1(y,\tau)}{\partial y}$ is the Jacobian matrix of ψ_1),

$$u_1(y,\tau) = u(\Phi_1(y,\tau))$$

and

$$(L_1 u_1)(y,\tau) = div\left(g_1^{-1}(y,\tau) \nabla_y u_1\right) - \partial_\tau u_1.$$

We have

$$(Lu)(\Phi_1(y,\tau)) = (L_1 u_1)(y,\tau) + \left(\frac{\partial \psi_1(y,\tau)}{\partial \tau}\right)^* \left(\left(\frac{\partial \psi_1(y,\tau)}{\partial y}\right)^{-1}\right)^* \nabla_y u_1.$$

By (3.149), (3.150), (3.186), (3.187), (3.191) and (3.195) we have that there exist $\lambda_1 \in (0,1]$, $\Lambda_1 > 0$, λ_1 depending on λ and E only and Λ_1 depending on λ, Λ and E only, such that, when $(y,\tau), (z,s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\lambda_1 |\xi|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^n g_1^{ij}(y,\tau)\, \xi_i \xi_j \leq \lambda_1^{-1} |\xi|^2 \text{ ,} \tag{3.196}$$

$$\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\left(g_1^{ij}\left(y,\tau\right)-g_1^{ij}\left(z,s\right)\right)^2\right)^{1/2}\leq\frac{\Lambda_1}{R_1}\left(\left|y-z\right|^2+\left|\tau-s\right|\right)^{1/2}\ ,\tag{3.197}$$

$$\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\left(g_1^{ij}\left(y,\tau\right)-g_1^{ij}\left(y,s\right)\right)^2\right)^{1/2}\leq\frac{\Lambda_1}{R_1^2}\left|\tau-s\right|\tag{3.198}$$

and

$$\left|L_1u_1\right|\leq\Lambda_1\left(\frac{\left|\nabla u_1\right|}{R_1}+\frac{\left|u_1\right|}{R_1^2}\right)\ \text{, in } B_1^+\times\left(-R_1^2,0\right]\ .\tag{3.199}$$

Furthermore

$$u_1\left(y',0,\tau\right)=0,\text{ for every } y'\in B'_{R_1},\ \tau\in\left(-R_1^2,0\right]\ .\tag{3.200}$$

Now let $H\left(\tau\right)$ and $S\left(\tau\right)$ be respectively the positive square root of $g_1\left(0,\tau\right)$ and the Lipschitz continuous rotation of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $S\left(\tau\right)e_n=vers\left(H\left(\tau\right)e_n\right)$, for every $\tau\in\mathbb{R}$. Denote

$$K\left(\tau\right)=\left(H\left(\tau\right)\right)^{-1}S\left(\tau\right)\ ,\ g_2^{-1}\left(\widetilde{y},\tau\right)=\left(K\left(\tau\right)\right)^{-1}g_1^{-1}\left(K\left(\tau\right)\widetilde{y},\tau\right)\left(\left(K\left(\tau\right)\right)^{-1}\right)^*\ ,$$

$$u_2\left(\widetilde{y},\tau\right)=u_1\left(K\left(\tau\right)\widetilde{y},\tau\right)\ ,\ \left(L_2u_2\right)\left(\widetilde{y},\tau\right)=div\left(g_2^{-1}\left(\widetilde{y},\tau\right)\nabla_{\widetilde{y}}u_2\right)-\partial_\tau u_2\ .$$

We have

$$g_2^{-1}\left(0,\tau\right)=I_n\ \text{, for every } \tau\in\mathbb{R}\ ,$$

$$\left(L_1u_1\right)\left(K\left(\tau\right)\widetilde{y},\tau\right)=\left(L_2u_2\right)\left(\widetilde{y},\tau\right)+\left(K'\left(\tau\right)\widetilde{y}\right)K^{-1}\left(\tau\right)\nabla_{\widetilde{y}}u_2\ .$$

By (3.196)-(3.200) and by Proposition 3.3.6 we have that there exist $\lambda_2\in(0,1]$, $\Lambda_2>0$ and $C>1$, λ_2 depending on λ and E only and Λ_2, C depending on λ, Λ and E only such that we have, setting $R_2=\frac{R_1}{C}$, for every $\left(\widetilde{y},\tau\right),\left(\widetilde{y}_*,s\right)\in\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $\xi\in\mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\lambda_2\left|\xi\right|^2\leq\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}g_2^{ij}\left(\widetilde{y},\tau\right)\xi_i\xi_j\leq\lambda_2^{-1}\left|\xi\right|^2\ ,\tag{3.201}$$

$$\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\left(g_2^{ij}\left(\widetilde{y},\tau\right)-g_2^{ij}\left(\widetilde{y}_*,s\right)\right)^2\right)^{1/2}\leq\frac{\Lambda_2}{R_2}\left(\left|\widetilde{y}-\widetilde{y}_*\right|^2+\left|\tau-s\right|\right)^{1/2}\ ,\tag{3.202}$$

$$\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\left(g_2^{ij}\left(\widetilde{y},\tau\right)-g_2^{ij}\left(\widetilde{y}_*,s\right)\right)^2\right)^{1/2}\leq\frac{\Lambda_2}{R_2^2}\left|\tau-s\right|\ ,\tag{3.203}$$

$$\left|L_2u_2\right|\leq\Lambda_2\left(\frac{\left|\nabla u_2\right|}{R_2}+\frac{\left|u_2\right|}{R_2^2}\right)\ \text{, in } B_2^+\times\left(-R_2^2,0\right]\tag{3.204}$$

and

$$u_2\left(\widetilde{y}',0,\tau\right)=0,\text{ for every } \widetilde{y}'\in B'_{R_2},\ \tau\in\left(-R_2^2,0\right]\ .\tag{3.205}$$

For the sake of brevity we shall omit the sign "$\sim$" over y.

Now we adapt ideas in [1] to the case of time varying coefficients. Let ζ be a function belonging to $C_0^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\right)$ and such that $supp\,\zeta \subset B_1'$, $\zeta \geq 0$ and $\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \zeta\left(y'\right) dy' = 1$. Denote by $\zeta_{(n)}$ the function $y_n^{1-n}\zeta\left(\frac{y'}{y_n}\right)$. Denote

$$\beta\left(z', \tau\right) = -g_2^{-1}\left(z', 0, \tau\right) e_n \ ,$$

$$w_j\left(z', z_n, \tau\right) = z_j - z_n\left(\zeta_{(n)} * \beta_j\left(., \tau\right)\right)\left(z'\right) \ , \ j = 1, ..., n-1 \ ,$$

$$w_n\left(z', z_n, \tau\right) = -z_n\left(\zeta_{(n)} * \beta_n\left(., \tau\right)\right)\left(z'\right) \ .$$

With $\psi_2\left(., \tau\right) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ we denote the map whose components are defined as follows, for each $j = 1, ..., n$

$$\left(\psi_2\right)_j\left(z', z_n, \tau\right) = \begin{cases} w_j\left(z', z_n, \tau\right) \ , \text{ for } z_n \geq 0, \\ 4w_j\left(z', z_n, \tau\right) - 3w_j\left(z', z_n, \tau\right), \text{ for } z_n < 0. \end{cases}$$

It turns out that ψ_2 is a $C^{1,1}$ function with respect to z and it is a Lipschitz continuous function with respect to $\tau \in \left[0, R_2^2\right)$. Moreover there exist constants $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in [1, +\infty)$ depending on λ, Λ and E only such that, setting $\rho_1 = \frac{R_2}{C_1}$, $\rho_2 = \frac{R_2}{C_2}$, we have, for every $\tau \in \left(-R_2^2, 0\right]$,

i) $\psi_2\left(z, \tau\right) \in B_{\rho_1}$, for every $z \in B_{\rho_2}$,
ii) $\psi_2\left(z', 0, \tau\right) = \left(z', 0\right)$, for every $z' \in B'_{\rho_2}$,
iii) $\psi_2\left(z, \tau\right) \in B^+_{\rho_1}$, for every $z \in B^+_{\rho_2}$,
iv) $C_3^{-1}\left|z - z_*\right| \leq \left|\psi_2\left(z, \tau\right) - \psi_2\left(z_*, \tau\right)\right| \leq C_3\left|z - z_*\right|$, for every $z, z_* \in B_{\rho_2}$,
v) $\left|\frac{\partial^2\psi_2(z,\tau)}{\partial z_i \partial z_j}\right| \leq C_3$, for every $z \in B_{\rho_2}$,
vi) $C_3^{-1} \leq \left|\det \frac{\partial\psi_2(z,\tau)}{\partial z}\right| \leq C_3$, for every $z \in B_{\rho_2}$.

Let us denote

$$u_3\left(z, \tau\right) = u_2\left(\psi_2\left(z, \tau\right), \tau\right) \ , \ B\left(u_3\right) = \left(\frac{\partial\psi_2\left(z, \tau\right)}{\partial\tau}\right)^*\left(\left(\frac{\partial\psi_2\left(z, \tau\right)}{\partial z}\right)^{-1}\right)^*\nabla_z u_3 \ ,$$

$$g_3^{-1}\left(z, \tau\right) = \left(\frac{\partial\psi_2\left(z, \tau\right)}{\partial y}\right)^{-1} g_2^{-1}\left(\psi_2\left(z, \tau\right), \tau\right)\left(\left(\frac{\partial\psi_2\left(z, \tau\right)}{\partial z}\right)^{-1}\right)^* \ , \ J\left(z, \tau\right) = \left|\det\frac{\partial\psi_2\left(z, \tau\right)}{\partial z}\right| .$$

We have, for every $\tau \in \left[0, R_2^2\right)$ and $z' \in B'_{\rho_2}$,

$$J\left(0, \tau\right) g_3^{-1}\left(0, \tau\right) = I_n \ ,$$

$$g_3^{nj}\left(z', 0, \tau\right) = g_3^{jn}\left(z', 0, \tau\right) = 0 \ , \text{ for } j = 1, ..., n-1.$$

Moreover by (3.201)-(3.203) we have that there exist $\lambda_3 \in (0, 1]$, $\Lambda_3 > 0$ depending on λ, Λ and E only such that for every $\left(z, \tau\right), \left(z_*, s\right) \in B^+_{\rho_2} \times \left[0, \rho_2^2\right)$ and every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$\lambda_3\left|\xi\right|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^n g_3^{ij}\left(z, \tau\right)\xi_i\xi_j \leq \lambda_3^{-1}\left|\xi\right|^2 \ ,$$

$$\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\left(g_3^{ij}\left(z,\tau\right)-g_3^{ij}\left(z_*,s\right)\right)^2\right)^{1/2}\leq\frac{\Lambda_3}{R_3}\left(\left|z-z_*\right|^2+\left|\tau-s\right|\right)^{1/2}\ ,$$

$$\left(L_2u_2\right)\left(\psi_2\left(z,\tau\right),\tau\right)=\left(L_3u_3\right)\left(z,\tau\right)+B\left(u_3\right)\ , \tag{3.206}$$

where

$$\left(L_3u_3\right)\left(z,\tau\right)=\frac{1}{J\left(z,\tau\right)}div\left(J\left(z,\tau\right)g_3^{-1}\left(z,\tau\right)\nabla_z u_3\right)-\partial_\tau u_3\ .$$

By (3.204) and (3.206) we have

$$\left|div\left(g_3^{-1}\nabla_z u_3\right)-\partial_\tau u_3\right|\leq C\left(\frac{\left|\nabla u_3\right|}{\rho_2}+\frac{\left|u_3\right|}{\rho_2^2}\right)\ \text{, in } B^+_{\rho_2}\times\left[0,\rho_2^2\right)\ ,$$

where C depends on λ, Λ and E only.
For every $(z,\tau)\in B_{\rho_2}\times\left(-\rho_2^2,0\right]$, let us denote by $\overline{g}_3^{-1}\left(z,\tau\right)=\left\{\overline{g}_3^{ij}\left(z,\tau\right)\right\}_{i,j=1}^n$ the symmetric matrix whose entries are given by

$$\overline{g}_3^{ij}\left(z',z_n,\tau\right)=g_3^{ij}\left(z',\left|z_n\right|,\tau\right)\ \text{, if either } 1\leq i,j\leq n-1 \text{ or } i=j=n,$$

$$\overline{g}_3^{nj}\left(z',z_n,\tau\right)=\overline{g}_3^{jn}\left(z',z_n,\tau\right)=sgn\left(z_n\right)g_3^{jn}\left(z',\left|z_n\right|,\tau\right)\ \text{, if } 1\leq j\leq n-1.$$

It turns out that $\overline{g}_3^{-1}$ satisfies the same ellipticity condition and Lipschitz condition as g_3^{-1}.
Denoting

$$v\left(z,\tau\right)=sgn\left(z_n\right)u_3\left(z',\left|z_n\right|,\tau\right)\ \text{, for every }\ (z,\tau)\in B_{\rho_2}\times\left[0,\rho_2^2\right),$$

we have that v belongs to $H^{2,1}\left(B_{\rho_2}\times\left(-\rho_2^2,0\right)\right)$ and satisfies the inequality

$$\left|div\left(\overline{g}_3^{-1}\nabla_z u_3\right)-\partial_\tau u_3\right|\leq C\left(\frac{\left|\nabla u_3\right|}{\rho_2}+\frac{\left|u_3\right|}{\rho_2^2}\right)\ \text{, in } B_{\rho_2}\times\left(-\rho_2^2,0\right]\ ,$$

where C depends on λ, Λ and E only.
By Theorem 3.3.3 we have there exist constants $\eta_2\in(0,1)$ and $C>1$ depending on λ, Λ and E only such that for every $0<r\leq\rho\leq\eta_2\rho_2$ we have

$$\int_{B_\rho}v^2\left(x,0\right)dx\leq\frac{C\rho_2^2}{\rho^2}\left(\rho_2^{-2}\int_{B_{\rho_2}\times\left(-\rho_2^2,0\right)}v^2dX\right)^{1-\overline{\theta}_1}\left(\int_{B_r}v^2\left(x,0\right)dx\right)^{\overline{\theta}_1}\ , \tag{3.207}$$

where

$$\overline{\theta}_1=\frac{1}{C\log\frac{\rho_2}{r}}.$$

Now, denoting by $\psi_3\left(z,\tau\right)=\psi_1\left(\Gamma\left(\tau\right)\psi_2\left(z,\tau\right),\tau\right)$, we have for every $\rho\in(0,\rho_2)$ and $\tau\in\left(-\rho_2^2,0\right]$

$$Q_{C^{-1}\rho,\varphi}\left(\tau\right)\subset\left(\psi_3\left(.,\tau\right)\right)\left(B^+_\rho\right)\subset Q_{C\rho,\varphi}\left(\tau\right)\ , \tag{3.208}$$

where C, $C>1$, depends on λ, Λ and E only. By (3.207) and (3.208), by using the change of variables $x=\psi_3\left(z,\tau\right)$, $s=\tau$ we obtain (3.189).■

3.4 Smallness propagation estimates

Let us introduce some notations that we shall use in Proposition 3.4.1 below. Let α, δ and R be positive numbers such that $\alpha < \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\delta \leq 1$. Let $\eta_1 \in (0,1)$ be defined in Theorem 3.3.3. Given $X_0 = (x_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|\zeta| = 1$, we denote

$$\mathcal{C}\left(x_0, \zeta, \alpha, R\right) = \left\{ x \in B_R\left(x_0\right) : \frac{\left(x - x_0\right) \cdot \zeta}{\left|x - x_0\right|} > \cos\alpha \right\} , \tag{3.209}$$

$$\mathcal{S}\left(X_0, \zeta, \alpha, \delta, R\right) = \left\{ (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : x \in \mathcal{C}\left(x_0, \zeta, \alpha, R\right) ,\ -\left(\delta\left(x - x_0\right) \cdot \zeta\right)^2 < t - t_0 \leq 0 \right\} , \tag{3.210}$$

$$\begin{gathered}\alpha_1 = \arcsin\left(\min\left\{\sin\alpha, \delta\left(1 - \sin\alpha\right)\right\}\right) , \\ \mu_1 = \frac{R}{1 + \sin\alpha_1} , \ w_1 = x_0 + \mu_1 \zeta , \ \rho_1 = \frac{1}{4}\mu_1 \eta_1 \sin\alpha_1 , \\ a = \frac{1 - \frac{1}{4}\eta_1 \sin\alpha_1}{1 + \frac{1}{4}\eta_1 \sin\alpha_1}. \end{gathered} \tag{3.211}$$

Proposition 3.4.1 ***(smallness propagation estimate)****. Let us take positive numbers $\alpha, \gamma, \delta, H$ and R such that $\alpha < \frac{\pi}{2}$, $\gamma \leq 1$ and $\delta \leq 1$. Let L be the parabolic operator of Theorem 3.3.3. Assume that u, $u \in H^{2,1}_{loc}\left(\mathcal{S}\left(X_0, \zeta, \alpha, \delta, R\right)\right)$, satisfies the differential inequality*

$$|Lu| \leq \Lambda\left(\frac{|\nabla u|}{R} + \frac{|u|}{R^2}\right), \ in\ \mathcal{S}\left(X_0, \zeta, \alpha, \delta, R\right) \tag{3.212}$$

and

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{S}(X_0,\zeta,\alpha,\delta,R))} + R^\gamma\left[u\left(., t_0\right)\right]_{\gamma, \mathcal{C}(x_0,\zeta,\alpha,R)} \leq H . \tag{3.213}$$

Then, setting $\sigma_1 = \left\|u\left(., t_0\right)\right\|_{L^\infty\left(B_{\rho_1(w_1)}\right)}$ we have

$$\left|u\left(x_0, t_0\right)\right| \leq CH\left|\log\frac{\sigma_1}{eH}\right|^{-B} , \tag{3.214}$$

where C depend on λ, Λ, α and γ only and

$$B = \frac{|\log a|}{C_1} , \tag{3.215}$$

where a is given by (3.211) and C_1, $C_1 > 0$, depends on λ and Λ only.

Proof. With no loss of generality we can assume $x_0 = 0$, $t_0 = 0$, $\zeta = e_n$. Denote

$$\mu_k = a^{k-1}\mu_1 , \ w_k = \mu_k e_n , \ \rho_k = a^{k-1}\rho_1 , \ d_k = \mu_k - \rho_k = a^{k-1}\mu_1\left(1 - \eta_1 \sin\beta\right) ,$$

where a is defined by (3.211).

It is simple to check that, for every $k \geq 1$, the following inclusions hold true

$$B_{\rho_{k+1}}\left(w_{k+1}\right) \subset B_{3\rho_k}\left(w_k\right) \subset B_{4\eta_1^{-1}\rho_k}\left(w_k\right) \subset \mathcal{C}\left(0, e_n, \beta, R\right) \ , \tag{3.216}$$

$$B_{4\eta_1^{-1}\rho_k}\left(w_k\right) \times \left(-4\eta_1^{-1}\rho_k, 0\right] \subset \mathcal{S}\left(0, e_n, \alpha, \delta, R\right) \ . \tag{3.217}$$

For a number r, $r \in (0, d_1]$, to be chosen later, let $\overline{k}$ be the smallest positive integer such that $d_k \leq r$. We have

$$\frac{\left|\log\left(r/d_1\right)\right|}{\left|\log a\right|} \leq \overline{k} - 1 \leq \frac{\left|\log\left(r/d_1\right)\right|}{\left|\log a\right|} + 1. \tag{3.218}$$

Denote

$$\sigma_j = \left(\int_{B_{\rho_j}\left(w_j\right)} u^2\left(x, 0\right) dx\right)^{1/2} \ , \ j = 1, 2 \ldots \overline{k} \ .$$

By Theorem 3.3.3, (3.216), (3.217) and since

$$\sigma_{j+1} \leq \left(\int_{B_{3\rho_j}\left(w_j\right)} u^2\left(x, 0\right) dx\right)^{1/2} \ , \ j = 1, 2 \ldots \overline{k} - 1 \ ,$$

we obtain

$$\sigma_{j+1}^2 \leq C H^{2\left(1-\theta_*\right)} \sigma_j^{2\theta_*}, \ j = 1, 2 \ldots \overline{k} - 1 \ , \tag{3.219}$$

where $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}\left(0, e_n, \alpha, \delta, R\right)$,

$$\theta_* = \frac{1}{C_0 \log \frac{4}{\eta_1}}$$

and C, C_0, depend on λ and Λ only.
By iterating (3.219) we get

$$\sigma_{\overline{k}}^2 \leq C^{\frac{1}{1-\theta_*}} H^{2\left(1-\theta_*^{\overline{k}}\right)} \sigma_1^{2\theta_*^{\overline{k}}} \ . \tag{3.220}$$

Let us recall the following interpolation inequality

$$\|v\|_{L^\infty\left(B_\rho\right)} \leq C\left(\left(\int_{B_\rho} v^2 dx\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2\gamma+n}} [v]_{\gamma, B_\rho}^{\frac{n}{2\gamma+n}} + \left(\rho^{-n}\int_{B_\rho} v^2 dx\right)^{1/2}\right) \ , \tag{3.221}$$

where C is an absolute constant.

By (3.213) and (3.221) we have

$$\left\|u\left(., 0\right)\right\|_{L^\infty\left(B_{\rho_{\overline{k}}}\left(w_{\overline{k}}\right)\right)} \leq C H^{\frac{n}{2\gamma+n}} \sigma_{\overline{k}}^{\frac{2\gamma}{2\gamma+n}} \ , \tag{3.222}$$

where C depend on λ and Λ only.
Let us consider the point $x_r = r e_n$. Noticing that $x \in B_{\rho_{\overline{k}}}\left(w_{\overline{k}}\right)$, by (3.213) and (3.222) we have

$$\left|u\left(0, 0\right)\right| \leq \left|u\left(x_r, 0\right) - u\left(0, 0\right)\right| + \left|u\left(x_r, 0\right)\right| \leq C H\left(\left(\frac{r}{d_1}\right)^\gamma + \left(\frac{\sigma_{\overline{k}}}{H}\right)^{\frac{2\gamma}{2\gamma+n}}\right) \ ,$$

where C depend on λ and Λ only.
From the above obtained inequality and by (3.220) we get

$$\left|u\left(0,0\right)\right| \leq CH\left(\left(\frac{r}{d_1}\right)^{\gamma}+\left(\frac{\sigma_1}{H}\right)^{\frac{2\gamma\theta_*^{\overline{k}}}{2\gamma+n}}\right)\ , \tag{3.223}$$

where C depend on λ, Λ and α only.
Let us choose

$$r = d_1\left|\log\left(e^{-1}\left(\frac{\sigma_1}{H}\right)^{\frac{2\gamma}{2\gamma+n}}\right)\right|^{-\frac{\left|\log a\right|}{2\left|\log\theta_*\right|}}\ .$$

By (3.218) and (3.223) we have

$$\left|u\left(0,0\right)\right| \leq CH\left|\log\left(\frac{\sigma_1}{eH}\right)\right|^{-\frac{\left|\log a\right|}{2\gamma\left|\log\theta_*\right|}}$$

and we obtain(3.214) with $B = \frac{\left|\log a\right|}{2\gamma\left|\log\theta_*\right|}$.■

3.5 Stability estimates from Cauchy data

We are given positive numbers R, T, E, λ and Λ such that $\lambda \in (0,1]$. Let us consider the following parabolic operator

$$Lu = \partial_i\left(g^{ij}\left(x,t\right)\partial_j u\right) - \partial_t u + b_i\left(x,t\right)\partial_i u + c\left(x,t\right)u\ , \tag{3.224}$$

where $\left\{g^{ij}\left(x,t\right)\right\}_{i,j=1}^{n}$ is a real symmetric $n\times n$ matrix. When $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ $\left(x,t\right),\left(y,\tau\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ assume that

$$\lambda\left|\xi\right|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} g^{ij}\left(x,t\right)\xi_i\xi_j \leq \lambda^{-1}\left|\xi\right|^2 \tag{3.225}$$

and

$$\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\left(g^{ij}\left(x,t\right)-g^{ij}\left(y,\tau\right)\right)^2\right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{\Lambda}{R}\left(\left|x-y\right|^2+\left|t-\tau\right|\right)^{1/2}. \tag{3.226}$$

Concerning $b_i\left(x,t\right)$, $i=1,...n$ and $c\left(x,t\right)$ we assume that

$$R\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|b_i\right\|_{L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}\right)} + R^2\left\|c\right\|_{L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}\right)} \leq \Lambda\ . \tag{3.227}$$

Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function satisfying the conditions

$$\varphi\left(0\right) = \left|\nabla_{x'}\varphi\left(0\right)\right| = 0\ , \tag{3.228}$$

$$\left\|\varphi\right\|_{L^\infty\left(B'_R\right)} + R\left\|\nabla_{x'}\varphi\right\|_{L^\infty\left(B'_R\right)} + R^2\left\|D^2\varphi\right\|_{L^\infty\left(B'_R\right)} \leq ER\ . \tag{3.229}$$

For any positive numbers ρ and t_0 denote by

$$D_{\rho,\varphi}=\{x\in B_\rho : x_n>\varphi(x')\}\ \ ,\ D^{t_0}_{\rho,\varphi}=D_{\rho,\varphi}\times(0,t_0)\ \ ,$$

$$\Gamma_{\rho,\varphi}=\{x\in B_\rho : x_n=\varphi(x')\}\ \ ,\ \Gamma^{t_0}_{\rho,\varphi}=\Gamma_{\rho,\varphi}\times(0,t_0)\,.$$

If $x=(x',\varphi(x'))$, we denote by $\nu(x)$, or simply by ν, the unit vector of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$

$$\nu(x)=\frac{(\nabla_{x'}\varphi(x'),-1)}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla_{x'}\varphi(x')|^2}}\ .$$

Theorem 3.5.1 *Let L be the parabolic operator (3.224). Let $u\in H^{2,1}\left(D^T_{R,\varphi}\right)$ be a solution to the equation*

$$Lu=0,\ in\ D^T_{R,\varphi}\ . \tag{3.230}$$

Let

$$\varepsilon:=\|u\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2},\frac{3}{4}}\left(\Gamma^T_{R,\varphi}\right)}+R\left\|g^{ij}\partial_j u\nu_i\right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{4}}\left(\Gamma^T_{R,\varphi}\right)}\ . \tag{3.231}$$

We have that there exist constants C, $\eta_3\in(0,1)$, $s_1\in(0,1)$ depending on λ, Λ and E only such that for every $r\in\left(0,\min\left\{R,\sqrt{T}\right\}\right)$ we have

$$\|u\|_{L^2\left(D_{\eta_3 r,\varphi}\times(r^2,T)\right)}\leq C\left(\varepsilon^{s_1}\|u\|^{1-s_1}_{L^2\left(D^T_{R,\varphi}\right)}+\varepsilon\right)\ . \tag{3.232}$$

If, in addition, u satisfies

$$u(x,0)=0\ ,\ in\ D_{R,\varphi}\ , \tag{3.233}$$

then we have, for every $r\in(0,R]$,

$$\|u\|_{L^2\left(D^T_{\eta_3 r,\varphi}\right)}\leq C\left(\varepsilon^{s_1}\|u\|^{1-s_1}_{L^2\left(D^T_{R,\varphi}\right)}+\varepsilon\right), \tag{3.234}$$

where C depends λ, Λ and E only.

Proof. By using the extension theorem in Sobolev spaces, [113], there exists $v\in H^{2,1}\left(D^T_{R,\varphi}\right)$ such that

$$v=u\ ,\ g^{ij}\partial_j v\nu_i=g^{ij}\partial_j u\nu_i\ ,\ \text{on}\ \Gamma^T_{R,\varphi} \tag{3.235}$$

and

$$\|v\|_{H^{2,1}\left(D^T_{R,\varphi}\right)}\leq C\varepsilon\ , \tag{3.236}$$

where C depends on E only. Let $w=u-v$. We have that $w\in H^{2,1}\left(D^T_{R,\varphi}\right)$ and w satisfies

$$Lw=-Lv,\ \text{in}\ D^T_{R,\varphi}\ , \tag{3.237}$$

$$w=0\ ,\ g^{ij}\partial_j w\nu_i=0\ ,\ \text{on}\ \Gamma^T_{R,\varphi}\ . \tag{3.238}$$

Define

$$\overline{f}=\begin{cases} -Lv\ , \text{ in } D^T_{R,\varphi}\ , \\ 0\ , \text{ in } \left(B_R\times(0,T)\right)\setminus D^T_{R,\varphi} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\overline{w}=\begin{cases} w\ , \text{ in } D^T_{R,\varphi}\ , \\ 0\ , \text{ in } \left(B_R\times(0,T)\right)\setminus D^T_{R,\varphi}. \end{cases}$$

Since $w=g^{ij}\partial_j w\nu_i=0$, on $\Gamma^T_{R,\varphi}$, we have $\overline{w}\in H^{2,1}\left(B_R\times(0,T)\right)$ and $\overline{w}$ satisfies

$$L\overline{w}=\overline{f}\ , \text{ in } B_R\times(0,T)\ . \tag{3.239}$$

Let $z\in H^{2,1}\left(B_R\times(0,T)\right)$ be the solution to the following initial-boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} Lz=\overline{f}\ , \text{ in } B_R\times(0,T)\ , \\ z_{|\partial_p(B_R\times(0,T))}=0\ , \end{cases} \tag{3.240}$$

where $\partial_p\left(B_R\times(0,T)\right)=(\partial B_R\times(0,T])\cup(B_R\times\{0\})$ is the parabolic boundary of $B_R\times(0,T)$. We have by (3.236) and (3.240)

$$\|z\|_{H^{2,1}(B_R\times(0,T))}\leq C\left\|\overline{f}\right\|_{L^2(B_R\times(0,T))}\leq C'\varepsilon\ , \tag{3.241}$$

where C and C' depend on λ, Λ and E only. Denote by w_1 the function $\overline{w}-z$, by (3.239) and (3.240) we have $w_1\in H^{2,1}\left(B_R\times(0,T)\right)$ and

$$Lw_1=0\ , \text{ in } B_R\times(0,T)\ . \tag{3.242}$$

Let r be any number belonging to $\left(0,\min\left\{R,\sqrt{T}\right\}\right]$. Let us denote by $r_1=r\min\left\{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{E}\right\}$, $r_2=\eta_1 r_1$, $r_3=\dfrac{\eta_1 r_1}{4}$, where η_1 is defined as in Theorem 3.3.3. Notice that, by (3.228) and (3.229) we have

$$B_{r_3}\left(-r_3e_n\right)\subset B_R\setminus D_{R,\varphi}\ . \tag{3.243}$$

Since $Lw_1=0$, in $B_{r_1}\left(-r_3e_n\right)\times(0,T)$, by Theorem 3.3.3 we have, for every $t\in\left[r^2,T\right]$,

$$\|w_1(.,t)\|^2_{L^2\left(B_{r_2}(-r_3e_n)\right)} \tag{3.244}$$

$$\leq C\|w_1(.,t)\|^{2s_1}_{L^2\left(B_{r_3}(-r_3e_n)\right)}\|w_1(.,t)\|^{2(1-s_1)}_{L^2\left(B_{r_1}(-r_3e_n)\times(0,T)\right)}\ ,$$

where C and s_1, $s_1\in(0,1)$, depend on λ and Λ only. By integrating both sides of last inequality with respect to t over $\left(r^2,T\right)$ and by Hölder inequality, we get

$$\|w_1\|^2_{L^2\left(B_{r_2}(-r_3e_n)\times(r^2,T)\right)} \tag{3.245}$$

$$\leq C'\|w\|^{2s_1}_{L^2\left(B_{r_3}(-r_3e_n)\times(r^2,T)\right)}\|w_1\|^{2(1-s_1)}_{L^2\left(B_{r_1}(-r_3e_n)\times(0,T)\right)}\ ,$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only.

By (3.236), (3.241), the triangle inequality and recalling the definition of w we have

$$\|w_1\|_{L^2\left(B_{r_1}(-r_3e_n)\times(0,T)\right)} \leq \|u\|_{L^2\left(D^T_{R,\varphi}\right)} + C\varepsilon \ , \tag{3.246}$$

where C depends on λ, Λ and E only.

By (3.243) we have $w_1 = -z$ in $B_{r_3}(-r_3e_n)\times(0,T)$, so using (3.241) we have

$$\|w_1\|_{L^2\left(B_{r_2}(-r_3e_n)\times(r^2,T)\right)} \leq C\varepsilon \ , \tag{3.247}$$

where C depends on λ, Λ and E only.
Since $D_{3r_3,\varphi}\subset B_{r_2}(-r_3e_n)\cap D_{R,\varphi}$, using (3.236), (3.241) and the triangle inequality we have

$$\|w_1\|_{L^2\left(B_{r_2}(-r_3e_n)\times(r^2,T)\right)} \geq \|w_1\|_{L^2\left(D_{3r_3,\varphi}\times(r^2,T)\right)}$$

$$= \|u-v-z\|_{L^2\left(D_{3r_3,\varphi}\times(r^2,T)\right)} \geq \|u\|_{L^2\left(D_{3r_3,\varphi}\times(r^2,T)\right)} - C\varepsilon \ ,$$

therefore

$$\|u\|_{L^2\left(D_{3r_3,\varphi}\times(r^2,T)\right)} \leq \|w_1\|_{L^2\left(B_{r_2}(-r_3e_n)\times(r^2,T)\right)} + C\varepsilon \ , \tag{3.248}$$

where C depend on λ, Λ and E only.
By (3.245), (3.246), (3.247) and (3.248) we obtain

$$\|u\|_{L^2\left(D_{3r_3,\varphi}\times(r^2,T)\right)} \leq C\left(\varepsilon^{s_1}\|u\|^{1-s_1}_{L^2\left(D^T_{R,\varphi}\right)} + \varepsilon\right) \ ,$$

where C depend on λ, Λ and E only, so (3.232) is proved.

To prove (3.234) we only need some slight variations of the previous proof. Indeed, due to (3.233) we can choose the function v in such a way that, besides (3.246) and (3.247), v satisfies $v(.,0) = 0$ on $D_{R,\varphi}$. Therefore $w_1 \in H^{2,1}(B_R\times(0,T))$ and

$$w_1(.,0) = 0 \ , \text{ in } B_R \ .$$

Now, considering the trivial extension $\widetilde{w}_1$ of w_1 to $B_R\times(-\infty,T)$

$$\widetilde{w}_1 = \begin{cases} w_1 \ , \text{ in } B_R\times(0,T) \ , \\ 0 \ , \text{ in } B_R\times(-\infty,0) \, , \end{cases}$$

we have that $\widetilde{w}_1 \in H^{2,1}(B_R\times(-\infty,T))$ and

$$L\widetilde{w}_1 = 0, \text{ in } B_R\times(-\infty,T) \, .$$

Therefore applying Theorem 3.3.3 to the function $\widetilde{w}_1$ we have that (3.244) holds true for every $t\in[0,T]$. Hence we can replace interval $\left(r^2,T\right)$ with interval $(0,T)$ in (3.245). Finally by definition of w_1 we have

$$\|u\|_{L^2\left(D^T_{3r_3,\varphi}\right)} \leq C\left(\varepsilon^{s_1}\|u\|^{1-s_1}_{L^2\left(D^T_{R,\varphi}\right)} + \varepsilon\right) \ ,$$

where C depend on λ, Λ and E only, so (3.234) is proved.■

4 Stability estimates for Dirichlet inverse problem with unknown time-varying boundaries

In this section $\{\Omega(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ will be a family of bounded domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$, where T is a given positive number. We shall suppose that the boundary of $\Omega((-\infty,+\infty)) = \bigcup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \Omega(t)\times\{t\}$ is sufficiently smooth, but for every $t\in\mathbb{R}$ a part $I(t)$ of $\partial\Omega(t)$ is not known. The inverse problem we are interested in determining $I(t)$, for every $t\in(0,T)$, by means of thermal measurements on the accessible part $A(t) := \partial\Omega(t) \setminus I(t)$. In what follows, for the sake of simplicity, we shall assume that $A(t)$ is not time varying, so we set $A(t) = A$. Given a nontrivial function f on $A\times(0,T)$, let us consider the following Cauchy-Dirichlet (direct) problem

$$\begin{cases} div\left(\kappa(x,t,u)\nabla u\right) - \partial_t u = 0, & \text{in } \Omega((0,T)), \\ u = f, & \text{on } A\times(0,T], \\ u = 0, & \text{on } I((0,T]), \\ u(.,0) = u_0, & \text{in } \Omega(0)\ , \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

where $\kappa(x,t,u) = \left\{\kappa^{ij}(x,t,u)\right\}_{i,j=1}^{n}$ denotes a known symmetric matrix which satisfies a hypothesis of uniform ellipticity and some smothness conditions that we shall specify below.

Assume that $\Omega(0)$ is known. Given an open portion Σ of $\partial\Omega(t)$ such that $\Sigma\subset A$, we consider the inverse problems of determinig $I(t)$, $t\in(0,T]$, from the knowledge of $\kappa(x,t,u)\nabla u\cdot\nu$ on $\Sigma\times[0,T]$, where ν denotes the exterior unit normal to $\Omega(t)$, for every $t\in[0,T]$.

i) A priori information on the domains $\Omega(t)$.

Given R_0, M positive numbers, we assume

$$|\Omega(t)| \le MR_0^n\ , \text{ for every } t\in[0,T], \tag{4.2}$$

here and below $|\Omega(t)|$ denotes the (n-dimensional) Lebesgue measure of $\Omega(t)$. For every $t\in[0,T]$ we shall distinguish two nonempty parts $A(t) = A$, $I(t)$ in $\partial\Omega(t)$ and we assume

$$I(t)\cup A = \partial\Omega(t)\ \ , \operatorname{Int}(I(t))\cap\operatorname{Int}(A) = \varnothing\ , \ I(t)\cap A = \partial A = \partial I(t)\ \ . \tag{4.3}$$

Here, interior and boundaries are intented in the relative topology in $\partial\Omega(t)$.

Concerning the regularity of $\partial\Omega([0,T])$ we assume that, for a number $\beta\in(0,1)$ and a positive number E we have

$$\partial\Omega([0,T]) \text{ is a portion of } \partial\Omega((-\infty,+\infty)) \tag{4.4}$$
$$\text{of class } C^{2,\beta} \text{ with constants } R_0,\ E$$

and also

$$A\times[0,T],\ I([0,T]) \text{ are portions of } \partial\Omega((-\infty,+\infty)) \tag{4.5}$$
$$\text{of class } C^{2,\beta} \text{ with constants } R_0,\ E.$$

In addition we assume that there exist open portions Σ, $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ within A such that $\Sigma \subset \widetilde{\Sigma}$ and there exists a point $P_0 \in \Sigma$ such that

$$\partial\Omega\left(t\right) \cap B_{R_0}\left(P_0\right) \subset \Sigma \text{ , for every } t \in [0,T] \tag{4.6}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\Sigma} \cap \left(I\left(t\right)\right)^{R_0} = \varnothing \text{ , for every } t \in [0,T] \text{ ,} \tag{4.7}$$

where $\left(I\left(t\right)\right)^{R_0} = \{x \in \partial\Omega\left(t\right) : dist\left(x, I\left(t\right)\right) < R_0\}$.

Remark 4.0.2 *Let t be any number in $[0,T]$. Observe that (4.4) automatically implies a lower bound on the diameter of every connected component of $\partial\Omega\left(t\right)$. In addition, by combining (4.2) with (4.4), an upper bound of the diameter of $\Omega\left(t\right)$. Note also that (4.2) and (4.4) implicitly comprise an a priori upper bound on the number of connected components of $\partial\Omega\left(t\right)$.*

ii) Assumptions about the initial and boundary data.

Let F_0 be a given positive number and let $F_1 : [0,T] \to [0,+\infty)$ be a given strictly increasing continuous function on $[0,T]$ such that $F_1\left(0\right) = 0$. We assume the following conditions on the initial data u_0 and the Dirichlet data f appearing in problem (4.1)

$$u_0 \in C^{2,\beta}\left(\Omega\left(0\right)\right) \text{ , } u_0 = 0 \text{ on } I\left(0\right) \text{ ,} \tag{4.8}$$

$$\left\|u_0\right\|_{C^{2,\beta}\left(\Omega\left(0\right)\right)} \leq F_0, \tag{4.9}$$

$$f \in C^{2,\beta}\left(A \times \left(0,T\right)\right), \tag{4.10}$$

$$f\left(.,0\right) = u_0\left(.\right) \text{ on } A, \tag{4.11}$$

$$supp\, f\left(.,t\right) \subset \widetilde{\Sigma}, \text{ for every } t \in [0,T], \tag{4.12}$$

$$\left\|f\right\|_{C^{2,\beta}\left(A\times\left(0,T\right)\right)} \leq F_0, \tag{4.13}$$

$$\left\|f\left(.,t\right)\right\|_{L^\infty\left(A\right)} \geq F_1\left(t\right) \text{ , for every } t \in [0,T]. \tag{4.14}$$

iii) Assumptions on the thermal conductivity κ.

The thermal conductivity κ is assumed to be a given function from $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ with values $n \times n$ matrices satisfying the following conditions. For given constants λ_0, Λ_0, $\lambda_0 \in (0,1]$, $\Lambda_0 \geq 0$, we have, for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $(x,t,z) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lambda_0 \left|\xi\right|^2 \leq \kappa\left(x,t,z\right)\xi \cdot \xi \leq \lambda_0^{-1}\left|\xi\right|^2, \tag{4.15}$$

$$R_0 \left\|\nabla_x \kappa\right\|_{L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^{n+2}\right)} + R_0^2 \left\|\partial_t \kappa\right\|_{L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^{n+2}\right)} + \left\|\partial_u^2 \kappa\right\|_{L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^{n+2}\right)} \leq \Lambda_0 \text{ .} \tag{4.16}$$

In the sequel we shall refer to the set $\left\{\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta, R_0^2 T^{-1}, F_1\left(.\right)\right\}$ as to the *a priori data.*

Theorem 4.0.3 *Let* $\{\Omega_1(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$, $\{\Omega_2(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ *be two families of domains satisfying (4.2), (4.4). For any* $i = 1, 2$ *and any* $t \in [0, T]$ *let* $A_i(t)$, $I_i(t)$ *satisfying (4.3) and (4.5), be the accessible and inaccessible part of* $\partial\Omega_i(t)$, *respectively. Assume that for any* $t \in [0, T]$ $A_1(t) = A_2(t) = A$ *and that* $\Omega_1(t)$ *and* $\Omega_2(t)$ *lie on the same side of* A. *Let us take* Σ, $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ *such that* $\Sigma \subset \widetilde{\Sigma} \subset A$ *satisfying (4.7). Assume that*

$$\Omega_1(0) = \Omega_2(0) . \tag{4.17}$$

Let $u_0 \in C^{2,\beta}(\Omega_1(0))$ *and* $f \in C^{2,\beta}(A \times (0, T))$ *satisfy (4.8)-(4.14). Let us assume that (4.15) and (4.16) are satisfied and let* $u_i \in C^{2,\beta}(\Omega_i([0, T]))$ *be the solution to (4.1) when* $\Omega([0, T]) = \Omega_i([0, T])$, $i = 1, 2$.

If, given $\varepsilon > 0$, *we have*

$$R_0 \|\kappa_1 \nabla u_1 \cdot \nu - \kappa_2 \nabla u_2 \cdot \nu\|_{L^2(\Sigma\times(0,T))} \leq \varepsilon \ , \tag{4.18}$$

where $\kappa_i = \kappa(x, t, u_i(x, t))$, $i = 1, 2$, *then we have*

$$\sup_{t\in[\tau,T]} d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1(t)}, \overline{\Omega_2(t)}\right) \leq R_0 C_1(\tau) \left|\log\varepsilon\right|^{-\frac{1}{C_2(\tau)}} \ , \tag{4.19}$$

for every $\tau \in (0, T]$ *and* $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, *where* $C_1(\tau)$ *and* $C_2(\tau)$ *are positive constants depending on* $\tau, \lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta, R_0^2 T^{-1}$ *and* $F_1(.)$ *only.*

Here $d_{\mathcal{H}}$ denotes the Hausdorff distance, namely for every $t \in [0, T]$

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1(t)}, \overline{\Omega_2(t)}\right) = \max\left\{\sup_{x\in\overline{\Omega_1(t)}} dist\left(x, \overline{\Omega_2(t)}\right), \sup_{x\in\overline{\Omega_2(t)}} dist\left(x, \overline{\Omega_1(t)}\right)\right\}.$$

4.1 Proof of Theorem 4.0.3

Here and in the sequel we shall denote, for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, by $G(t)$ the connected component of $\Omega_1(t) \cap \Omega_2(t)$ such that $\widetilde{\Sigma} \subset \overline{G(t)}$.

From regularity estimates for solutions to the Cauchy-Dirichlet problem for parabolic equations [111], we have

$$\|u_i\|_{C^{2,\beta}(\Omega_i([0,T]))} \leq H \ , \tag{4.20}$$

where H is a positive constant depending on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.

The proof of Theorem 4.0.3 is obtained from a sequence of propositions. In the present section we give the statement of such propositions in the next section we shall prove them.

Proposition 4.1.1 ***(Stability estimates of continuation from Cauchy data)***. *Let the hypotheses of Theorem 4.0.3 be satisfied. We have*

$$\int_{\Omega_i(t)\smallsetminus G(t)} u_i^2(x, t)\, dx \leq R_0^n H^2 \omega\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{H}\right) \ , \ i = 1, 2, \ t \in [0, T] \ , \tag{4.21}$$

where ω is an increasing continuous function on $[0,+\infty)$ which satisfies

$$\omega\left(s\right) \leq C\left(\log\left|\log s\right|\right)^{-\frac{1}{n}} \quad , \textit{for every } s \in \left(0, e^{-1}\right) \tag{4.22}$$

and C depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.

Proposition 4.1.2 ***(Improved stability estimate of continuation from Cauchy data).*** *Let the hypotheses of Proposition 4.1.1 satisfied and, in addition let us assume that there exist $L > 0$ and $\rho_0 \in (0, R_0]$ such that, for any $t \in [0,T]$, $\partial G\left(t\right)$ is of Lipschitz class with constants ρ_0, L. Then (4.21) holds with ω satisfying*

$$\omega\left(s\right) \leq C\left|\log s\right|^{-\frac{1}{C}} \quad , \textit{for every } s \in \left(0,1\right), \tag{4.23}$$

where C, $C > 1$, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.

Proposition 4.1.3 ***(Lipschitz stability estimate of continuation from the interior).*** *Let $\left\{\Omega\left(t\right)\right\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be a family of domains satisfying (4.2), (4.3), (4.4) and (4.5). Let $u_0 \in C^{2,\beta}\left(\Omega\left(0\right)\right)$ satisfy (4.8) and (4.9). Let $f \in C^{2,\beta}\left(A \times (0,T)\right)$ satisfy (4.11)-(4.14). Assume that (4.15) and (4.16) are satisfied and let $u \in C^{2,\beta}\left(\Omega\left([0,T]\right)\right)$ be the solution to (4.1).*

For every $\overline{\rho} > 0$, every $t \in [0,T]$ and every $z \in \left(\Omega\left(t\right)\right)_{2\overline{\rho}}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_{\overline{\rho}}(z)} u^2\left(x,t\right)dx \qquad\qquad (4.24) \\ \geq\quad & H^2 \overline{\rho}^n \exp\left(-e^{\frac{CR_0^n}{\min\left\{t^{n/2}, \overline{\rho}^n\right\}}} \left(\frac{F_1\left(t\right)}{H}\right)^{\frac{CR_0}{\min\left\{t^{1/2}, \overline{\rho}\right\}}}\right) \quad , \end{aligned}$$

where C, $C > 1$, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.

In what follows we need this definition.

Definition 4.1.4 ***(relative graphs).*** *We shall say that two bounded domains Ω_1 and Ω_2 in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of class $C^{1,\beta}$ with constants R_0, E are relative graphs if for any $P \in \partial\Omega_1$ there exists a rigid transformation of coordinates under which we have $P \equiv 0$ and there exist $\varphi_{P,1}, \varphi_{P,2} \in C^{1,\beta}\left(B'_{r_0}\left(0\right)\right)$, where $\frac{r_0}{R_0} \leq 1$ depends on E and β only, satisfying the following conditions*

i) $\varphi_{P,1}\left(0\right) = 0$, $\left|\varphi_{P,2}\left(0\right)\right| \leq \frac{r_0}{2}$,

ii) $\left\|\varphi_{P,i}\right\|_{C^{1,\beta}\left(B'_{r_0}(0)\right)} \leq ER_0$,

iii) $\Omega_i \cap B_{r_0}\left(0\right) = \left\{x \in B_{r_0}\left(0\right) : x_n > \varphi_{P,i}\left(x'\right)\right\}$, $i = 1,2$.

We shall denote

$$\gamma\left(\Omega_1, \Omega_2\right) = \sup_{P\in\partial\Omega_1} \left\|\varphi_{P,1} - \varphi_{P,2}\right\|_{L^\infty\left(B'_{r_0}(0)\right)} \quad . \tag{4.25}$$

Proposition 4.1.5 *Let Ω_1 and Ω_2 be two domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of class $C^{1,\beta}$ with constants R_0, E and satisfying $|\Omega_i| \leq MR_0^n$. Assume that Ω_1 and Ω_2 are relative graphs. Then there exists a $C^{1,\beta}$ diffeomorphism $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\Phi(\Omega_2) = \Omega_1$ and*

$$\|\Phi - Id\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\gamma(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \ , \tag{4.26}$$

where C depends on E, M and β only.

Proposition 4.1.6 *Let $\{\Omega_1(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ and $\{\Omega_2(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be two families of domains satisfying (4.2), (4.4). We have, for every $t, \tau \in [0, T]$,*

$$\left| d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1(t)}, \overline{\Omega_2(t)}\right) - d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1(\tau)}, \overline{\Omega_2(\tau)}\right)\right| \leq C\frac{|t-\tau|}{R_0} \ , \tag{4.27}$$

where C depends on E, M and β only.

Definition 4.1.7 ***(modified distance).*** *Let Ω_1 and Ω_2 be bounded domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$. We call modified distance between Ω_1 and Ω_2 the number*

$$d_m(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = \max\left\{\sup_{x\in\partial\Omega_1} dist\left(x, \overline{\Omega_2}\right), \sup_{x\in\partial\Omega_2} dist\left(x, \overline{\Omega_1}\right)\right\} \ . \tag{4.28}$$

Notice that

$$d_m(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \leq d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1}, \overline{\Omega_2}\right) \ , \tag{4.29}$$

but, in general, the reverse inequality does not hold as the following example makes clear: $\Omega_1 = B_1(0)$, $\Omega_2 = B_1(0) \setminus B_{1/2}(0)$. In this case $d_m(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = 0$, whereas $d_{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = \frac{1}{2}$. However, the following proposition holds true, [5].

Proposition 4.1.8 *Let Ω_1 and Ω_2 be bounded domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of class $C^{1,\beta}$ with constants R_0, E and satisfying $|\Omega_i| \leq MR_0^n$. There exist numbers d_0, $\rho_0 \in (0, R_0]$ such that $\frac{d_0}{R_0}$ and $\frac{\rho_0}{R_0}$ depend on β and E only, such that if we have*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1}, \overline{\Omega_2}\right) \leq d_0, \tag{4.30}$$

then the following facts hold true
i) Ω_1 and Ω_2 are relative graphs and

$$\gamma(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \leq Cd_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1}, \overline{\Omega_2}\right) \ , \tag{4.31}$$

where C depends β and E only,
ii) there exists an absolute positive constant c such that

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1}, \overline{\Omega_2}\right) \leq cd_m(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \ , \tag{4.32}$$

iii) any connected component of $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2$ has boundary of Lipschitz class with constants ρ_0, L, where ρ_0 is as above and $L > 0$ depends on E only.

Proof of Theorem 4.0.3. For the sake of simplicity we denote, for any $t \in [0,T]$, $d(t) = d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1(t)}, \overline{\Omega_2(t)}\right)$ and $d_m(t) = d_m(\Omega_1(t), \Omega_2(t))$. We will prove that denoting

$$\sigma = R_0^{-n} \max\left\{ \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \int_{\Omega_1(t)\setminus G(t)} u_1^2(x,t)\,dx,\ \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \int_{\Omega_2(t)\setminus G(t)} u_2^2(x,t)\,dx \right\}\ , \tag{4.33}$$

we have

$$d_m(t) \leq \frac{CR_0^{n+1}}{b(t)\min\left\{t^{n/2}, R_0^n\right\}} \left(\frac{\sigma}{MH^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\log \frac{C}{b(t)}}} \tag{4.34}$$

and

$$d(t) \leq \frac{CR_0^{n+2}}{b(t)\min\left\{t^{(n+1)/2}, R_0^{n+1}\right\}} \left(\frac{\sigma}{MH^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\log \frac{C}{b(t)}}}\ , \tag{4.35}$$

where

$$b(t) = \exp\left(-e^{\frac{CR_0^n}{\min\left\{t^{n/2}, R_0^n\right\}}} \left(\frac{F_1(t)}{H}\right)^{-\frac{CR_0}{\min\left\{t^{1/2}, R_0\right\}}} \right) \tag{4.36}$$

and C is a constant depending on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.

First we prove (4.34). Let $t \in [0,T]$ be fixed. Let us assume, without loss of generality, that there exists $x_0 \in I_1(t) \subset \partial\Omega_1(t)$ such that $dist(x_0, \Omega_2(t)) = d_m(t)$. By (4.33) we have

$$\int_{\Omega_1(t)\cap B_{d_m(t)}(x_0)} u_1^2(x,t)\,dx \leq R_0^n \sigma\ . \tag{4.37}$$

Let $\eta_2 \in (0,1)$ be defined in Theorem 3.3.3, η_2 depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only. Let us denote $R(t) = \min\left\{t^{1/2}, R_0\right\}$. We distinguish two cases. If $d_m(t) \geq \frac{\eta_2 R(t)}{2}$, let $\overline{d}(t) = \frac{\eta_2 R(t)}{2\left(1+\sqrt{1+E^2}\right)}$, $\overline{x}(t) = x_0 - \nu \overline{d}(t)\sqrt{1+E^2}$, where ν denotes the outer unit normal to $\Omega_1(t)$ at x_0. We have

$$B_{\overline{d}(t)}(\overline{x}(t)) \subset \Omega_1(t) \cap B_{\frac{\eta_2 R(t)}{2}}(x_0)\ ,\ dist\left(B_{\overline{d}(t)}(\overline{x}(t)), \partial\Omega_1(t)\right) \geq \overline{d}(t)\,. \tag{4.38}$$

By Proposition 4.1.3, (4.33) and (4.38) we obtain

$$\sigma \geq R_0^{-n} \int_{\Omega_1(t)\cap B_{\frac{\eta_2 R(t)}{2}}(x_0)} u_1^2(x,t)\,dx \geq \frac{H^2 R^n(t)}{CR_0^n} b(t)\ , \tag{4.39}$$

where $b(t)$ is defined by (4.36) and C, $C > 1$, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only. Since it is evident that $d_m(t) \leq CR_0$, where C depends on E and M only, by (4.39) we have

$$d_m(t) \leq \frac{CR_0^{n+1}}{R^n(t)\,b(t)} \frac{\sigma}{H^2}\ , \tag{4.40}$$

where C, $C>1$, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.

Otherwise, if $d_m(t) < \frac{\eta_2 R(t)}{2}$, let us apply Theorem 3.3.5 with $r = d_m(t)$, $\rho = \frac{\eta_2 R(t)}{2}$, $R = R(t)$ and by (4.37) we have

$$\int_{\Omega_1(t)\cap B_{\frac{\eta_2 R(t)}{2}}(x_0)} u_1^2(x,t)\,dx \leq CH^2 R^n(t) \left(\frac{R_0^n \sigma}{R^n(t) H^2}\right)^{\overline{\frac{1}{C\log \frac{R(t)}{d_m(t)}}}} , \tag{4.41}$$

and C, $C>1$, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.
By (4.41) and Proposition 4.1.3, taking into account that $\sigma < MH^2$, we have

$$d_m(t) \leq MR(t) \left(\frac{R_0^n \sigma}{MH^2 R_0^n}\right)^{\overline{\frac{1}{C\log \frac{R(t)}{d_m(t)}}}} , \tag{4.42}$$

where C, $C>1$, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only. By (4.40) and (4.42) we have that $d_m(t)$ satisfies (4.34).

Now we prove (4.35). Without loss of generality, we may assume that there exists $y_0 \in \overline{\Omega_1(t)}$ such that $dist\left(y_0, \overline{\Omega_2(t)}\right) = d(t)$. Denoting $\delta(t) = dist(y_0, \partial\Omega_1(t))$, let us distinguish the following three cases:
i) $\delta(t) \leq \frac{1}{2} d(t)$,
ii) $\frac{1}{2} d(t) < \delta(t) \leq \frac{1}{2} d_0$,
iii) $\delta(t) > \max\left\{\frac{1}{2} d(t), \frac{1}{2} d_0\right\}$,
where d_0 is the number introduced in Proposition 4.1.8.

If case i) occurs, let $z_0 \in \partial\Omega_1(t)$ be such that $|y_0 - z_0| = \delta(t)$. We have

$$d_m(t) \geq dist\left(z_0, \overline{\Omega_2(t)}\right) \geq dist\left(y_0, \overline{\Omega_2(t)}\right) - |y_0 - z_0| = d(t) - \delta(t) \geq \delta(t) ,$$

hence $\delta(t) \leq d_m(t)$ and $d(t) - \delta(t) \leq d_m(t)$. Therefore $d(t) \leq 2 d_m(t)$ and by (4.34) we have (4.35).

If case ii) occurs then $d(t) < d_0$ and Proposition 4.1.8 applies, hence by (4.32) we have that $d(t) \leq c d_m(t)$, where c is an absolute constant, therefore $d(t)$ satisfies (4.35).

If case iii) occurs, let us denote $R_1(t) = \min\left\{\frac{d_0}{\sqrt{2E}}, R(t)\right\}$ and $d_1(t) = \min\left\{\frac{d(t)}{2}, \frac{\eta_1 R_1(t)}{2}\right\}$, where $\eta_1 \in (0,1)$ has been introduced in Theorem 3.3.3 and depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.
We have

$$B_{d_1(t)}(y_0) \subset \Omega_1(t) \setminus \overline{\Omega_2(t)} \tag{4.43}$$

and

$$B_{R_1(t)}(y_0) \times \left(t - R_1^2(t), t\right] \subset \Omega_1((0,t]) . \tag{4.44}$$

Now let us apply Therem 3.3.3 with $r = d_1(t)$, $\rho = \eta_1 R(t)$, $R = R_1(t)$. By (4.37), (4.43) and (4.44) we have

$$\int_{B_{\eta_1 R(t)}(y_0)} u_1^2(x,t)\,dx \leq CH^2 R_1^n(t) \left(\frac{R_0^n \sigma}{R_1^n(t) H^2}\right)^{\overline{\frac{1}{C\log \frac{R_1(t)}{d_1(t)}}}} , \tag{4.45}$$

where C, $C>1$, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2T^{-1}$ only. By (4.45) and Proposition 4.1.3 we have (4.35).

Let us introduce some notation. Let $T_0 = \min\left\{R_0^2, T\right\}$,

$$\psi(\mu) = \exp\left(\mu^{-1/2}\log\frac{\|F_1\|_{L^\infty(0,T)}}{F(T_0\mu)} + \mu^{-n/2}\log\left(\frac{\|F_1\|_{L^\infty(0,T)}}{H}+2\right)\right)\ ,\ \mu\in(0,1]$$

and let $\Psi_0 = \inf\limits_{(0,1]}\psi$, notice $\Psi_0 \geq 1$.
By (4.35) and Proposition 4.1.6 we have

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} d(t) \leq R_0\left(e^{(\psi(\mu))^{C_1}}\left(\frac{\sigma}{MH^2}\right)^{(\psi(\mu))^{-C_1}}+\mu\right)\ ,\ \text{for every } \mu\in(0,1]\,, \tag{4.46}$$

where C_1, $C_1>1$, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2T^{-1}$ only.
Now, if $\left|\log\left(\frac{\sigma}{MH^2}\right)\right| > (2\Psi_0)^{C_1}$, then we choose

$$\mu = \overline{\mu}(\sigma) := \left(\psi^{-1}\left(\left|\log\left(\frac{\sigma}{MH^2}\right)\right|\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{4C_1}}$$

at the right-hand side of (4.46) (here ψ^{-1} is the inverse of function ψ). Otherwise the left-hand side of (4.46) can be easily estimated from above as follows

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1(t)},\overline{\Omega_2(t)}\right) \leq \sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left(\operatorname{diam}(\Omega_1(t))+\operatorname{diam}(\Omega_2(t))\right) \leq C_2 e^{(2\Psi_0)^{C_1}}\frac{\sigma}{MH^2}\ ,$$

(here diam$(\Omega_i(t))$ denotes the diameter of $\Omega_i(t)$, $i=1,2$) where C_2 depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2T^{-1}$ only. Therefore, denoting

$$a = e^{-(2\Psi_0)^{C_1}}MH^2\ ,\ m_0 = 1-(2\Psi_0)^{-\frac{C_1}{2}}$$

and

$$\phi(s) = \left\{\begin{array}{c} \overline{\mu}(s)+\exp\left(-m_0\left|\log\left(\frac{s}{MH^2}\right)\right|^{3/4}\right),\ \text{if } s\in(0,a)\,, \\ C_2a^{-1}s\ ,\ \text{if } s\in[a,+\infty)\,, \end{array}\right. \tag{4.47}$$

(notice that $m_0>0$) we have

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1(t)},\overline{\Omega_2(t)}\right) \leq R_0\phi(\sigma)\ . \tag{4.48}$$

By (4.48) and Proposition 4.1.1 we have, for every $\varepsilon\in\left(0,He^{-1}\right)$,

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1(t)},\overline{\Omega_2(t)}\right) \leq R_0\phi\left(\frac{1}{M}\left(\log\left|\log\frac{\varepsilon}{H}\right|\right)^{-1/n}\right). \tag{4.49}$$

Now, let us define

$$\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0 = \sup\left\{\tau\in\left(0,e^{-1}\right) : \phi\left(\frac{1}{M}\left(\log|\log\tau|\right)^{-1/n}\right) \leq \frac{d_0}{R_0}\right\}\ .$$

By Proposition 4.1.8 we have that, if $\varepsilon \in (0, \widetilde{\varepsilon}_0 H]$, there exist $\rho_0 \in (0, R_0]$ and $L > 0$, $\frac{\rho_0}{R_0}$ and L depending on E only, such that $\partial G(t)$ is of Lipschitz class of constants ρ_0, L. Therefore by Proposition 4.1.2 and (4.35) we have

$$d\,(t) \leq \frac{C R_0^{n+2}}{b\,(t) \min\left\{t^{(n+1)/2}, R_0^{n+1}\right\}} \left(C \left|\log \frac{\varepsilon}{H}\right|^{-1/C}\right)^{\frac{1}{\log \frac{C}{b(t)}}} ,$$

where C, $C > 1$, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.
Otherwise, if $\varepsilon > \widetilde{\varepsilon}_0 H$, we have trivially

$$d\,(t) \leq C' \frac{\varepsilon}{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0 H} ,$$

where C' depends on E and M only, and (4.19) follows.■

4.2 Proofs of Propositions 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.1.6

Proof of Proposition 4.1.1. Let us introduce the following notation

$$u = u_1 - u_2 \text{ , in } G\left((0,T)\right),$$

$$b\,(x,t) = -\partial_u \kappa\,(x,t,u_1\,(x,t))\,\nabla u_2\,(x,t) \text{ , in } G\left((0,T)\right),$$

$$\begin{aligned} c\,(x,t) &= -\int_0^1 \partial_u^2 \kappa\,(x,t,u_1\,(x,t) + \tau u\,(x,t))\,\nabla u_2\,(x,t) \cdot \nabla u_2\,(x,t)\,d\tau \\ &\quad - \int_0^1 \operatorname{tr}\left(\partial_u \kappa\,(x,t,u_1\,(x,t) + \tau u\,(x,t))\,D^2 u_2\,(x,t)\right) d\tau \text{ , in } G\left((0,T)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Denoting $\kappa_1\,(x,t) = \kappa\,(x,t,u_1\,(x,t))$, we have that the function u satisfies the equation

$$div\left(\kappa_1\,(x,t)\,\nabla u\right) - \partial_t u + b\,(x,t) \cdot \nabla u + c\,(x,t)\,u = 0 \text{ , in } G\left((0,T)\right) \tag{4.50}$$

and the following Cauchy conditions

$$u = 0 \text{ , on } \Sigma \times (0,T), \tag{4.51}$$

$$\|\kappa_1 \nabla u \cdot \nu\|_{L^2(\Sigma\times(0,T))} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{R_0} . \tag{4.52}$$

Moreover

$$u\,(.,0) = 0 \text{ , on } G\,(0) . \tag{4.53}$$

Now, let us recall the interpolation inequality

$$\|g\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{4}}(\Sigma\times(0,T))} \leq C \|g\|^{\mu}_{L^2(\Sigma\times(0,T))} \|g\|^{1-\mu}_{C^{0,1}(\Sigma\times(0,T))} , \tag{4.54}$$

where $\mu = \frac{1}{1+n}$ and C depends on E and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.

By (4.20), (4.52) and (4.54) we have

$$\|\kappa_1 \nabla u \cdot \nu\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{4}}(\Sigma\times(0,T))} \leq C\varepsilon^{\mu} H^{1-\mu} \ , \tag{4.55}$$

where C depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.
In order to apply Theorem 3.5.1 notice that by (4.20) we have

$$R_0 \|b\|_{L^\infty(G((0,T)))} + R_0^2 \|c\|_{L^\infty(G((0,T)))} \leq C \ ,$$

where C depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.
Let us denote $R_1 = \frac{\eta_3 R_0}{1+(1+E^2)^{1/2}}$, $P_1 = P_0 - \nu\left(1+E^2\right)^{1/2} R_1$, where $\eta_3 \in (0,1)$, defined in Theorem 3.5.1, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only. Notice $(B_{R_0}(P_0)\times(0,T)) \cap G((0,T)) \subset B_{R_1}(P_1)\times(0,T)$. By (3.234), (4.20), (4.50), (4.51) (4.55) and the local boundedness estimate, [111], we have

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty\left(B_{R_1/2}(P_1)\times(0,T)\right)} \leq C\varepsilon^{\mu s_1} H^{1-\mu s_1} \ , \tag{4.56}$$

where $s_1 \in (0,1)$, defined in Theorem 3.5.1, and C depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.

Let $\tau \in (0,T]$, let $r_0 \in \left(0, \frac{R_1}{2}\right]$ and denote by

$$\widetilde{\Sigma}^i_{r_0}(\tau) = \left\{x \in \Omega_i(\tau) : dist\left(x, \widetilde{\Sigma}\right) = dist\left(x, \partial\Omega_i(\tau)\right) = r_0\right\} \ , \ i = 1, 2.$$

Notice that $\widetilde{\Sigma}^1_{r_0}(\tau) = \widetilde{\Sigma}^2_{r_0}(\tau)$ and that $\widetilde{\Sigma}^i_{r_0}(\tau)$ does not really depend on τ. Let $V_{r_0}(\tau)$ be the connected component of $(\Omega_1(\tau))_{r_0} \cap (\Omega_2(\tau))_{r_0}$ whose closure contains $\widetilde{\Sigma}^1_{r_0}(\tau)$, we have $B_{R_1}(P_1) \subset V_{r_0}(\tau)$. Now it is easy to check that if $r_0 \in (0, \overline{r}_0]$, where $\overline{r}_0 = \min\left\{\frac{R_1}{2}, \frac{R_0^3 E}{2T}, \frac{2T}{ER_0}\right\}$, then for every $x \in V_{r_0}(\tau)$ we have

$$B_{r_0/2}(x) \times \left(\tau - \left(\frac{r_0}{2}\right)^2, \tau\right] \subset \Omega_1((-\infty,\tau]) \cap \Omega_2((-\infty,\tau]) \ . \tag{4.57}$$

Let $r_0 \in (0, \overline{r}_0]$ and let $\overline{x} \in \overline{V_{r_0}(\tau)}$ be such that $|u(\overline{x},\tau)| = \max\limits_{\overline{V_{r_0}(\tau)}} |u(.,\tau)|$. Denote by $\rho_0 = \frac{\eta_1}{6} r_0$, where $\eta_1 \in (0,1)$ is defined in Theorem 3.3.3 and depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only. Let γ be an arc in $\overline{V_{r_0}(\tau)}$ joining $\overline{x}$ to P_1. Let us define x_i, $i = 1, ..., m$ as follows: $x_1 = P_1$, $x_{i+1} = \gamma(t_i)$, where $t_i = \max\{t : |\gamma(t) - x_i| = 2\rho_0\}$ if $|x_i - \overline{x}| > 2\rho_0$, otherwise let $i = m$ and stop the process. By construction the balls $B_{\rho_0}(x_i)$ are pairwise disjoint, $|x_{i+1} - x_i| = 2\rho_0$, for $i = 1, ..., m-1$, $|x_m - \overline{x}| \leq 2\rho_0$. Hence we have $m \leq C_0\left(\frac{R_0}{r_0}\right)^n$, where C_0 depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only. By an iterated application of the two-sphere one-cylinder inequality (3.152) to the trivial extension $\widetilde{u}$ of u (i.e. $\widetilde{u}(.,t) = 0$ if $t < 0$) with $R = \frac{r_0}{2}$, $\rho = 3\rho_0$, $r = \rho_0$, over the chain of balls $B_{\rho_0}(x_i)$, and by (4.20), (4.56) and (4.57), we have

$$\left(\rho_0^{-n} \int_{B_{\rho_0}(\overline{x})} u^2(x,\tau)\,dx\right)^{1/2} \leq C\varepsilon^{\mu s_1 s_2^m} H^{1-\mu s_1 s_2^m} \ , \tag{4.58}$$

where $s_1, s_2 \in (0,1)$ and C depend on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.
Let us recall the following interpolation inequality

$$\|v\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho)} \leq c \left(\|v\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho)} + \rho \, \|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho)} \right)^{\frac{n}{n+2}} \left(\rho^{-n} \int_{B_\rho} v^2 \right)^{\frac{2}{n+2}} \quad , \qquad (4.59)$$

where c is an absolute constant.
By (4.20), (4.56), (4.58) and (4.59) we have

$$\|u\,(.\tau)\|_{L^\infty\left(B_{\rho_0}(\overline{x})\right)} \leq C \varepsilon^{\widetilde{s}_1 s_2^m} H^{1-\widetilde{s}_1 s_2^m} \ , \qquad (4.60)$$

where $\widetilde{s}_1 = \frac{2 s_1 \mu}{n+2}$ and C depend on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.
By (4.60) we obtain

$$\|u\,(.\tau)\|_{L^\infty\left(V_{r_0}(\tau)\right)} \leq C \varepsilon^{\widetilde{s}_1 s_2^m} H^{1-\widetilde{s}_1 s_2^m} \ , \text{ for every } \tau \in [0,T] \, , \qquad (4.61)$$

where $\widetilde{s}_1$, s_2 and C are the same of (4.60).

We have, for every $\tau \in [0,T]$,

$$\Omega_1(\tau) \setminus G(\tau) \subset \left(\left(\Omega_1(\tau) \setminus (\Omega_1(\tau))_{r_0} \right) \setminus G(\tau) \right) \cup \omega_{r_0}(\tau) \ ,$$

where

$$\omega_{r_0}(\tau) = (\Omega_1(\tau))_{r_0} \setminus V_{r_0}(\tau)$$

and we denote by $\Gamma_{1,r_0}(\tau)$ and $\Gamma_{2,r_0}(\tau)$ subsets of $\partial\,(\Omega_1(\tau))_{r_0}$ and $\partial\,(\Omega_2(\tau))_{r_0} \cap \partial V_{r_0}(\tau)$ respectively such that we have

$$\partial \left((\Omega_1(\tau))_{r_0} \setminus V_{r_0}(\tau) \right) = \Gamma_{1,r_0}(\tau) \cup \Gamma_{2,r_0}(\tau) \ .$$

We prove (4.21) when $i = 1$, the case $i = 2$ being analogous.
We have, for every $\tau \in [0,T]$,

$$\int_{\Omega_1(\tau) \setminus G(\tau)} u_1^2(x,\tau)\, dx \qquad (4.62)$$

$$\leq \int_{\left(\Omega_1(\tau) \setminus (\Omega_1(\tau))_{r_0}\right) \setminus G(\tau)} u_1^2(x,\tau)\, dx + \int_{\omega_{r_0}(\tau)} u_1^2(x,\tau)\, dx \ .$$

By (4.20) we have

$$\int_{\left(\Omega_1(\tau) \setminus (\Omega_1(\tau))_{r_0}\right) \setminus G(\tau)} u_1^2(x,\tau)\, dx \leq C H^2 R_0^{n-1} r_0 \ , \qquad (4.63)$$

where C depends on E and M only.
By the divergence theorem we have

$$0 = \int_{\omega_{r_0}(\tau)} \left(div\left(\kappa_1(x,t)\, \nabla u_1\right) - \partial_t u_1 \right) u_1 dx dt \qquad (4.64)$$

$$\begin{aligned}= & \int_0^\tau dt\int_{\partial\omega_{r_0}(t)}\left(\kappa_1(x,t)\nabla u_1\cdot\nu\right)u_1ds-\int_{\omega_{r_0}((0,\tau))}\kappa_1(x,t)\nabla u_1\cdot\nabla u_1dxdt\\ & -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\omega_{r_0}(\tau)}u_1^2(x,\tau)\,dx-\frac{1}{2}\int_{\left(\partial\omega_{r_0}\right)((0,\tau))}u_1^2\left(N\cdot e_{n+1}\right)dS\ ,\end{aligned}$$

where, as usual, $(\partial\omega_{r_0})((0,\tau))=\bigcup_{t\in(0,\tau)}\partial\omega_{r_0}(t)\times\{t\}$, N is the exterior unit normal to $\omega_{r_0}((0,\tau))$, ds and dS are the $(n-1)$-dimensional and the n-dimensional surface element respectively.
Therefore

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_{\omega_{r_0}(\tau)}u_1^2(x,\tau)\,dx \tag{4.65}$$

$$\leq\int_0^\tau dt\int_{\partial\omega_{r_0}(t)}\left(\kappa_1(x,t)\nabla u_1\cdot\nu\right)u_1ds+\frac{1}{2}\int_{\left(\partial\omega_{r_0}\right)((0,\tau))}u_1^2\left(N\cdot e_{n+1}\right)dS.$$

By (4.65) and (4.20) we have

$$\int_{\omega_{r_0}(\tau)}u_1^2(x,\tau)\,dx\leq\frac{CH}{R_0}\int_0^\tau dt\int_{\partial\omega_{r_0}(t)}|u_1(x,t)|\,ds \tag{4.66}$$

$$=\frac{CH}{R_0}\left(\int_0^\tau dt\int_{\Gamma_{1,r_0}(t)}|u_1(x,t)|\,ds+\int_0^\tau dt\int_{\Gamma_{2,r_0}(t)}|u_1(x,t)|\,ds\right)\ ,$$

where C depends on λ_0 and E only.

Now, let us notice that, if $t\in[0,\tau]$ and $r_0\in(0,\overline{r}_0]$ then $dist\left(x,\widetilde{\Sigma}\right)\geq\frac{R_1}{2}$ for every $x\in\Gamma_{1,r_0}(t)$. Therefore if $t\in[0,\tau]$ and $x\in\Gamma_{1,r_0}(t)$ then there exists $y\in\partial\Omega_1(t)\smallsetminus\widetilde{\Sigma}$ such that $|y-x|=dist\,(x,\partial\Omega_1(t))=r_0$. Since $suppf\,(.,t)\subset\widetilde{\Sigma}$ we have $u_1(y,t)=0$, hence by (4.20) we get, for every $x\in\Gamma_{1,r_0}(t)$, $t\in[0,\tau]$,

$$|u_1(x,t)|=|u_1(x,t)-u_1(y,t)|\leq\|\nabla u_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_1(t))}|x-y|\leq H\frac{r_0}{R_0}\ . \tag{4.67}$$

Analogously, if $t\in[0,\tau]$ and $x\in\Gamma_{2,r_0}(t)$ then there exists $y\in\partial\Omega_2(t)\smallsetminus\widetilde{\Sigma}$ such that $|y-x|=dist\,(x,\partial\Omega_2(t))=r_0$. Since $u_2(y,t)=0$, by (4.20) and (4.61) we obtain, for every $x\in\Gamma_{2,r_0}(t)$, $t\in[0,\tau]$,

$$|u_1(x,t)|\leq H\frac{r_0}{R_0}+|u(x,t)|\leq CH\left(\frac{r_0}{R_0}+\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{H}\right)^{\widetilde{s}_1s_2^m}\right)\ , \tag{4.68}$$

where C depend on $\lambda_0,\Lambda_0,E,M,F_0,\beta$ and $R_0^2T^{-1}$ only and $\widetilde{s}_1$, s_2 are the same of (4.61).

By (4.62), (4.63), (4.66), (4.67) and (4.68) we have, for every $\tau\in[0,T]$ and $r_0\in(0,\overline{r}_0]$,

$$\int_{\Omega_1(\tau)\smallsetminus G(\tau)}u_1^2(x,\tau)\,dx\leq CR_0^nH^2\left(\frac{r_0}{R_0}+\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{H}\right)^{\widetilde{s}_1s_2^m}\right)\ , \tag{4.69}$$

where C depend on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.
Denote

$$\widetilde{\varepsilon} = \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{H}\right)^{\widetilde{s}_1} ,$$

$$\widetilde{\varepsilon}_1 = \min\left\{e^{-1}, \exp\left(-\exp\left(2C_0\left(\frac{R_0}{\overline{r}_0}\right)^n |\log s_2|\right)\right)\right\}.$$

If $\widetilde{\varepsilon} < \widetilde{\varepsilon}_1$ then we choose

$$r_0 = R_0\left(\frac{2C_0 |\log s_2|}{\log|\log \widetilde{\varepsilon}|}\right)^{1/n}$$

at the right-hand side of (4.69) and we have

$$\int_{\Omega_1(\tau)\smallsetminus G(\tau)} u_1^2(x,\tau)\,dx \leq C R_0^n H^2 \left(\log\left|\log\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{H}\right)^{\widetilde{s}_1}\right|\right)^{-\frac{1}{n}} , \tag{4.70}$$

where C depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.
Otherwise, if $\widetilde{\varepsilon} \geq \widetilde{\varepsilon}_1$ then we have trivially

$$\int_{\Omega_1(\tau)\smallsetminus G(\tau)} u_1^2(x,\tau)\,dx \leq M R_0^n H^2 \leq \frac{M R_0^n H^2}{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_1}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{H}\right)^{\widetilde{s}_1} . \tag{4.71}$$

By (4.70) and (4.71) we have (4.21).■

Proof of Proposition 4.1.2. Let us prove (4.21) and (4.23) when $i = 1$, the case $i = 2$ being analogous. By the divergence theorem we have, for every $\tau \in [0,T]$

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_1(\tau)\smallsetminus G(\tau)} u_1^2(x,\tau)\,dx \tag{4.72}$$

$$\leq \int_0^\tau dt \int_{\partial(\Omega_1(t)\smallsetminus G(t))} (\kappa_1(x,t)\nabla u_1\cdot\nu)\,u_1 ds + \frac{1}{2}\int_{(\partial(\Omega_1\smallsetminus G))((0,\tau))} u_1^2 (N\cdot e_{n+1})\,dS .$$

Since, for every $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\partial(\Omega_1(t)\smallsetminus G(t)) \subset \left(\partial\Omega_1(t)\smallsetminus\widetilde{\Sigma}\right) \cup \left(\left(\partial\Omega_2(t)\smallsetminus\widetilde{\Sigma}\right)\cap\partial G(t)\right)$$

and since $u_i(.,t) = 0$ on $\partial\Omega_i(t)\smallsetminus\widetilde{\Sigma}$, , for every $t \in [0,T]$ and $i = 1,2$, by (4.20) and (4.72) we have, for every $\tau \in [0,T]$,

$$\int_{\Omega_1(\tau)\smallsetminus G(\tau)} u_1^2(x,\tau)\,dx \leq C H R_0^{n-2} T \|u\|_{L^\infty((\partial G)([0,\tau]))} , \tag{4.73}$$

where $u = u_1 - u_2$ and C depends on λ_0 and E only.
Now it is simple to check that for any $r \in (0, R_0]$, any $t_0 \in [0,\tau]$ and any $x \in \partial G(t_0)$ such that $dist(x, \partial G(t_0)) \geq r$ we have

$$dist(x, \partial\Omega_i(t)) \geq \frac{r}{2} \text{ , for every } t \in \left(t_0 - \frac{r^2}{2E+1}, t_0\right] , i = 1,2,$$

hence, since we have $\partial G(t) \subset \partial \Omega_1(t) \cup \partial \Omega_2(t)$, we obtain

$$dist\left(x, \partial G(t)\right) \geq \frac{r}{2} \text{ , for every } t \in \left(t_0 - \frac{r^2}{2E+1}, t_0\right] , \ i = 1, 2,$$

therefore

$$W_r(x, t_0) := B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x) \times \left(t_0 - \frac{r^2}{2E+1}, t_0\right] \subset G\left((-\infty, t_0]\right) \ . \tag{4.74}$$

Let $t_0 \in [0, \tau]$ and $z \in \partial G(t_0)$ be fixed. Since $\partial G(t_0)$ is of Lipschitz class with constants ρ_0, L there exists $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|\zeta| = 1$, such that $\mathcal{C}(z, \zeta, \alpha, R) \subset G(t_0)$, where $\alpha = \arctan\frac{1}{L}$ (recall that $\mathcal{C}(z, \zeta, \alpha, R)$ is defined by (3.209)). Let us denote $\overline{\mu} = \frac{\rho_0}{1+\sin\alpha}$ and, for any $\mu \in (0, \overline{\mu})$, $z_\mu = z + \mu\zeta$. We have

$$dist\left(z_\mu, \partial G(t_0)\right) \geq \mu \sin\alpha \text{ , for any } \mu \in (0, \overline{\mu}) \ , \tag{4.75}$$

Now, denoting with $\overline{\delta} = \frac{\sin\alpha}{\sqrt{2E+1}}$, $\overline{\rho} = \overline{\mu}\cos\frac{\alpha}{2}$, by (4.74) and (4.75) we have

$$\mathcal{S}\left((z, t_0), \zeta, \frac{\alpha}{2}, \overline{\delta}, \overline{\rho}\right) \subset \bigcup_{\mu \in (0, \overline{\mu})} W_{\mu \sin\alpha}(z_\mu, t_0) \subset G\left((-\infty, t_0]\right) \tag{4.76}$$

(recall that $\mathcal{S}\left((z, t_0), \zeta, \frac{\alpha}{2}, \overline{\delta}, \overline{\rho}\right)$ is defined by (3.210)).

Let us denote by $\widetilde{u}$ the trivial extension of u (i.e. $\widetilde{u}(., t) = 0$ if $t < 0$), by (4.20) we have

$$\|\widetilde{u}\|_{L^\infty\left(\mathcal{S}\left((z,t_0),\zeta,\frac{\alpha}{2},\overline{\delta},\overline{\rho}\right)\right)} + \overline{\rho}^{\beta}\left[\widetilde{u}(., t_0)\right]_{\beta, \mathcal{C}(z,\zeta,\alpha,\overline{\rho})} \leq H \ . \tag{4.77}$$

Denote by

$$\alpha_1 = \arcsin\left(\min\left\{\sin\frac{\alpha}{2}, \overline{\delta}\left(1 - \sin\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)\right\}\right) \ ,$$

$$\mu_1 = \frac{\overline{\rho}}{1 + \sin\alpha_1} \ , \ w_1 = z + \mu_1\zeta \ , \ \rho_1 = \frac{1}{4}\mu_1\eta_1\sin\alpha_1 \ ,$$

where $\eta_1 \in (0, 1)$ is defined in Theorem 3.3.3 and depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.
We have

$$dist\left(w_1, \partial G(t_0)\right) \geq \min\left\{\rho_0 - |w_1 - z|, |w_1 - z|\sin\alpha\right\} = \rho_0\widetilde{\eta} \ , \tag{4.78}$$

where

$$\widetilde{\eta} = \min\left\{1 - \frac{\cos\frac{\alpha}{2}}{1+\sin\alpha}\frac{1}{1+\sin\alpha_1}, \frac{\sin\alpha}{1+\sin\alpha_1}\frac{\cos\frac{\alpha}{2}}{1+\sin\alpha}\right\} .$$

Now $\left(G(t_0)\right)_{\frac{\rho_0\widetilde{\eta}}{2}}$ is connected and, by (4.78) $w_1 \in \left(G(t_0)\right)_{\frac{\rho_0\widetilde{\eta}}{2}}$. Therefore arguing as in the proof of Proposition 4.1.1, we get, by iterated application of the two-sphere one-cylinder inequality and by (4.56),

$$\left(\rho_1^{-n}\int_{B_{\rho_1}(\overline{x})} \widetilde{u}^2(x, t_0)\,dx\right)^{1/2} \leq C\varepsilon^{s_3}H^{1-s_3} \ , \tag{4.79}$$

where s_3, $s_3 \in (0,1)$, and C depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.
By (4.77), (4.79) and (3.214) we obtain

$$|u\left(z,t_0\right)| \leq CH \left|\log\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{H}\right)\right|^{\frac{-1}{C}} \quad , \tag{4.80}$$

where C, $C > 1$, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.
Finally (4.73) and (4.80) give (4.23).■

Proof of Proposition 4.1.3. Let $\tau \in (0,T]$ and $P \in \partial\Omega\left(\tau\right)$. There exists a rigid tranformation of space coordinates under which we have $(P,\tau) = (0,\tau)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\Omega\left((-\infty,+\infty)\right) \cap \left(B_{R_0}\left(0\right) \times \left(\tau - R_0^2, \tau + R_0^2\right)\right) \\ &= \left\{(x,t) \in B_{R_0}\left(0\right) \times \left(\tau - R_0^2, \tau + R_0^2\right) : x_n > \varphi\left(x',t\right)\right\} \ , \end{aligned}$$

where $\varphi \in C^{2,\beta}\left(B'_{R_0}\left(0\right) \times \left(\tau - R_0^2, \tau + R_0^2\right)\right)$ satisfying $\varphi\left(0,\tau\right) = 0$ and $\|\varphi\|_{C^{2,\beta}\left(B'_{R_0}(0)\times\left(\tau-R_0^2,\tau+R_0^2\right)\right)} \leq ER_0$.

Let us introduce the following notations

$$\rho_0 = \frac{R_0}{64\sqrt{2+E^2}} \ , \ y_0 = e_n \frac{R_0}{4} \ ,$$

$$\Gamma = \left\{\left(x', \varphi\left(x',\tau\right)\right) : x' \in B'_{R_0}\left(0\right)\right\} \ .$$

We have

$$B_{2\rho_0}\left(y_0\right) \subset \left(\Omega\left(\tau\right)\right)_{\rho_0} \ . \tag{4.81}$$

For $z \in \left(\Omega\left(\tau\right)\right)_{2\overline{\rho}}$ denote

$$\varepsilon_0 = \left(\overline{\rho}^{-n} \int_{B_{\overline{\rho}}(z)} u^2\left(x,\tau\right) dx\right)^{1/2} \tag{4.82}$$

and let $\rho_1 = \min\left\{\overline{\rho}, \rho_0\right\}$.

Let $y \in B_{2\rho_0}\left(y_0\right)$ and let γ be an arc in $\left(\Omega\left(\tau\right)\right)_{\rho_1}$ joining z to y. Since $dist\left(\gamma, \partial\Omega\left(\tau\right)\right) \geq \rho_1$, denoting $\sigma_0\left(\tau\right) = \min\left\{\sqrt{\tau}, \frac{\rho_1}{\sqrt{2E+4}}\right\}$, we have

$$B_{\sigma_0(\tau)}\left(x\right) \subset \left(\tau - \sigma_0^2\left(\tau\right), \tau\right] \subset \Omega\left((0,\tau]\right) \ , \text{for every } x \in \gamma. \tag{4.83}$$

Let us denote $\sigma_1\left(\tau\right) = \eta_1 \frac{\sigma_0(\tau)}{6}$, where $\eta_1 \in (0,1)$ is defined in Theorem 3.3.3 and depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only. Arguing as in Proposition 4.1.1 we define $x_i \in \gamma$, $i = 1,...,m$, such that $x_1 = z$, $|x_{i+1} - x_i| = 2\sigma_1\left(\tau\right)$, $i = 1,...,m$, $|x_m - y| \leq 2\sigma_1\left(\tau\right)$. Hence $m \leq m\left(\tau\right) := c_0 M \left(\frac{R_0}{2\sigma_1(\tau)}\right)^n$, where c_0 depends on n only. By an iterated application of inequality (3.152) with

$r=\sigma_1(\tau)$, $\rho=3\sigma_1(\tau)$, $R=\frac{1}{2}\sigma_0(\tau)$ over the chain of balls $B_{\sigma_1(\tau)}(x_i)$ and by (4.20), (4.82) and (4.83) we obtain

$$\left(\sigma_1^{-n}(\tau)\int_{B_{\sigma_1(\tau)}(y)}u^2(x,\tau)\,dx\right)^{1/2}\le C\varepsilon_0^{s_2^{m(\tau)}}H^{1-s_2^{m(\tau)}}\ , \tag{4.84}$$

where s_2, $s_2\in(0,1)$, and C, $C>1$, depend on $\lambda_0,\Lambda_0,E,M,F_0,\beta$ and $R_0^2T^{-1}$ only. By the interpolation inequality (4.59) and by (4.84) we get

$$\|u(.,\tau)\|_{L^\infty\left(B_{\sigma_1(\tau)}(y)\right)}\le C_1\varepsilon_0^{\mu(\tau)}H^{1-\mu(\tau)}\ , \tag{4.85}$$

where $\mu(\tau)=\frac{2}{n+2}s_2^{m(\tau)}$ and C_1, $C_1>1$, depends on $\lambda_0,\Lambda_0,E,M,F_0,\beta$ and $R_0^2T^{-1}$ only. Hence

$$\|u(.,\tau)\|_{L^\infty\left(B_{2\rho_0}(y_0)\right)}\le C_1\varepsilon_0^{\mu(\tau)}H^{1-\mu(\tau)}\ . \tag{4.86}$$

Now, in order to apply Proposition 3.4.1 let us introduce the following notation

$$\alpha=\arcsin\frac{1}{16\sqrt{2+E^2}}\ ,\ \delta_\tau=\frac{\sqrt{\tau}}{R_0}\ ,\ R_1=\frac{R_0}{4}\cos\alpha.$$

It is simple to check that

$$\mathcal{S}\left((0,\tau),e_n,\alpha,\delta_\tau,R_1\right)\subset\Omega\left((0,\tau]\right) \tag{4.87}$$

and

$$B_{\rho_2}(w_1)\subset\mathcal{C}\left(0,e_n,\alpha,R_1\right)\ , \tag{4.88}$$

where

$$w_1=\frac{R_1}{1+\sin\alpha_1(\tau)}e_n\ ,$$

$$\rho_2=\frac{1}{4}\eta_1\frac{R_1\sin\alpha_1(\tau)}{1+\sin\alpha_1(\tau)}\ ,$$

$$\alpha_1(\tau)=\arcsin\left(\min\left\{\sin\alpha,\delta_\tau\left(1-\sin\alpha\right)\right\}\right)\ .$$

(recall that $\mathcal{C}(0,e_n,\alpha,R_1)$ and $\mathcal{S}((0,\tau),e_n,\alpha,\delta_\tau,R_1)$ are defined by (3.209) and (3.210) respectively).
By (3.214), (4.20), (4.86), (4.87) and (4.88) we have, when $C_1\left(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{H}\right)^{\mu(\tau)}<1$,

$$|u(0,\tau)|\le C_2\left(\mu(\tau)\right)^{-B(\tau)}H\left|\log\left(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{eH}\right)\right|^{-B(\tau)}\ , \tag{4.89}$$

where

$$B(\tau)=\frac{1}{C_2}\left|\log\frac{1-\frac{1}{4}\eta_1\sin\alpha_1(\tau)}{1+\frac{1}{4}\eta_1\sin\alpha_1(\tau)}\right|\ , \tag{4.90}$$

and C_2, $C_2 > 1$, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only. Otherwise, if $C_1 \left(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{H}\right)^{\mu(\tau)} \geq 1$ then we have trivially

$$|u(0,\tau)| \leq H \leq C_1 H \left(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{H}\right)^{\mu(\tau)} \ , \tag{4.91}$$

By (4.89) and (4.91) we have

$$\|u(.,\tau)\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega(\tau))} \leq C_2 H \left(\frac{\log(eC_1)}{\mu(\tau)}\right)^{B(\tau)} \left|\log\left(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{eH}\right)\right|^{-B(\tau)} \ , \tag{4.92}$$

By (4.14) and (4.92) we get

$$F_1(\tau) \leq H e^{C\frac{R_0^{n-1}}{\min\left\{\tau^{(n-1)/2},\overline{\rho}^{n-1}\right\}}} \left|\log\left(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{eH}\right)\right|^{-\frac{\min\left\{\tau^{1/2},\overline{\rho}\right\}}{CR_0}} \ , \tag{4.93}$$

C, $C > 1$, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only. By (4.93) we obtain (4.24).$\blacksquare$

Proof of Proposition 4.1.5. The proof of such a Proposition is the same, with obvious changes, of Corollary 2.3 in [5].

Proof of Proposition 4.1.6. Let $t, \tau \in [0,T]$ satisfy $|t-\tau| \leq R_0^2 \min\left\{\frac{1}{2E}, 1\right\}$. By (4.4) we have that $\Omega_1(t)$ and $\Omega_1(\tau)$, $\Omega_2(t)$ and $\Omega_2(\tau)$ are relative graphs and

$$\gamma(\Omega_i(t), \Omega_i(\tau)) \leq E\frac{|t-\tau|}{R_0} \ , \ i = 1,2 \tag{4.94}$$

(recall that $\gamma(.,.)$ is defined by (4.25)).
By Proposition 4.1.5 and (4.94) there exists a $C^{1,\beta}$ diffeomorphisms $\Phi_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\Phi_i(\Omega_i(t)) = \Omega_i(\tau)$, $i = 1,2$, and

$$\|\Phi_i - Id\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \ , \ \left\|\Phi_i^{-1} - Id\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq CE\frac{|t-\tau|}{R_0}, \ i = 1,2, \tag{4.95}$$

where C depends on E, M and β and only.
Now let $\overline{x} \in \overline{\Omega_1(t)}$ be such that

$$dist(\overline{x}, \Omega_2(\tau)) = \sup_{x\in\Omega_1(t)} dist(x, \Omega_2(\tau)) \ .$$

By the triangular inequality and by (4.95) we have

$$dist(\overline{x}, \Omega_2(\tau)) \leq dist(\Phi_1(\overline{x}), \Omega_2(\tau)) + |\Phi_1(\overline{x}) - \overline{x}|$$

$$\leq \sup_{x\in\Omega_1(\tau)} dist(x, \Omega_2(\tau)) + CE\frac{|t-\tau|}{R_0} \ ,$$

where C depends on E, M and β and only. Hence

$$\sup_{x\in\Omega_1(t)} dist\left(x,\Omega_2\left(\tau\right)\right) \leq \sup_{x\in\Omega_1(\tau)} dist\left(x,\Omega_2\left(\tau\right)\right) + CE\frac{|t-\tau|}{R_0}\ , \tag{4.96}$$

where C is the same of above.
Now we will prove that there exists a constant C depending on E, M and β and only such that

$$\sup_{x\in\Omega_1(t)} dist\left(x,\Omega_2\left(t\right)\right) \leq \sup_{x\in\Omega_1(t)} dist\left(x,\Omega_2\left(\tau\right)\right) + CE\frac{|t-\tau|}{R_0}\ . \tag{4.97}$$

Let $x \in \Omega_1\left(t\right)$, we distinguish two cases
a) $x \notin \Omega_2\left(\tau\right)$,
b) $x \in \Omega_2\left(\tau\right)$.
If case a) occurs then there exists $z \in \partial\Omega_2\left(\tau\right)$ such that

$$dist\left(x,\Omega_2\left(\tau\right)\right) = dist\left(x,\partial\Omega_2\left(\tau\right)\right) = |x-z|\ . \tag{4.98}$$

Up to a rigid transformation of the space coordinates we have $z = \left(z',\varphi\left(z',\tau\right)\right)$, where $\varphi \in C^{2,\beta}\left(B'_{R_0}\left(0\right)\times\left(\tau-R_0^2,\tau+R_0^2\right)\right)$ and $\|\varphi\|_{C^{2,\beta}\left(B'_{R_0}(0)\times\left(\tau-R_0^2,\tau+R_0^2\right)\right)} \leq ER_0$. Therefore, for any $t \in \left(\tau-R_0^2,\tau+R_0^2\right)$ we have

$$|x-z| \geq \left|x-\left(z',\varphi\left(z',t\right)\right)\right| - \left|\varphi\left(z',t\right)-\varphi\left(z',\tau\right)\right| \geq dist\left(x,\Omega_2\left(t\right)\right) - E\frac{|t-\tau|}{R_0}\ ,$$

hence by (4.98) we get

$$dist\left(x,\Omega_2\left(t\right)\right) \leq dist\left(x,\Omega_2\left(\tau\right)\right) + E\frac{|t-\tau|}{R_0}\ .$$

If case b) occurs, by (4.95) we have

$$dist\left(x,\Omega_2\left(t\right)\right) \leq \left|x-\Phi_2^{-1}\left(x\right)\right| \leq CE\frac{|t-\tau|}{R_0}\ ,$$

where C depends on E, M and β and only.
Therefore, for any $x \in \Omega_1\left(t\right)$, we have

$$dist\left(x,\Omega_2\left(t\right)\right) \leq dist\left(x,\Omega_2\left(\tau\right)\right) + CE\frac{|t-\tau|}{R_0}\ ,$$

where C depends on E, M and β and only and (4.97) follows.
Now by (4.96) and (4.97) we have

$$\sup_{x\in\Omega_1(t)} dist\left(x,\Omega_2\left(t\right)\right) \leq \sup_{x\in\Omega_1(\tau)} dist\left(x,\Omega_2\left(\tau\right)\right) + CE\frac{|t-\tau|}{R_0}\ , \tag{4.99}$$

where C depends on E, M and β and only. Analogously we have

$$\sup_{x\in\Omega_2(t)} dist\left(x,\Omega_1\left(t\right)\right) \leq \sup_{x\in\Omega_2(\tau)} dist\left(x,\Omega_1\left(\tau\right)\right) + CE\frac{|t-\tau|}{R_0}\ , \tag{4.100}$$

where C is the same of (4.99).
By (4.99) and (4.100) we obtain

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1\left(t\right)},\overline{\Omega_2\left(t\right)}\right) \leq d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1\left(\tau\right)},\overline{\Omega_2\left(\tau\right)}\right) + CE\frac{|t-\tau|}{R_0}\ ,$$

where C is the same of (4.99) and (4.27) follows.■

4.3 Some extensions of Theorem 4.0.3

The extensions of Theorem 4.0.3 that we give in the present section can be proved with slight changes. We shall give short outline of the proofs.

Variant I. Assume that $\{\Omega_i\left(t\right)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$, $\{A_i\left(t\right)\}_{t\in[0,T]}$, $\{I_i\left(t\right)\}_{t\in[0,T]}$, $i=1,2$ satisfy the same hypotheses of Theorem 4.0.3, (in particular $A_i\left(t\right)=A$, $t\in[0,T]$, $i=1,2$) but instead of $\Omega_1\left(0\right)=\Omega_2\left(0\right)$ assume that $\partial A\cap\partial I_i\left(t\right)=\varnothing$ for $t\in[0,T]$, $i=1,2$ and

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1\left(0\right)},\overline{\Omega_2\left(0\right)}\right) \leq R_0\varepsilon\ . \tag{4.101}$$

Let $f\in C^{2,\beta}\left(A\times[0,T]\right)$ satisfy (4.13) and for any $t\in[0,T]$

$$\left(\frac{1}{|A|}\int_A\left|f\left(x,t\right)-f_A\left(t\right)\right|^2 ds\right)^{1/2} \geq F_1\left(t\right)\ , \tag{4.102}$$

where $f_A\left(t\right)=\frac{1}{|A|}\int_A f\left(x,t\right)ds$ and F_1 is a strictly increasing continuous function on $[0,T]$ such that $F_1\left(0\right)=0$. Let c_1, c_2 be two numbers satisfying the conditions

$$|c_i|\leq F_0\ ,\ i=1,2. \tag{4.103}$$

Let $u_0\in C^{2,\beta}\left(\mathbb{R}^n\right)$ satisfy

$$\|u_0\|_{C^{2,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\leq F_0\ ,\ u_0\left(.,0\right)=c_i,\ \text{on } I_i\left(0\right)\ ,\ i=1,2. \tag{4.104}$$

Let $u_i\in C^{2,\beta}\left(\Omega_i\left([0,T]\right)\right)$ be the solution to

$$\begin{cases} div\left(\kappa\left(x,t,u_i\right)\nabla u_i\right)-\partial_t u_i=0, & \text{in } \Omega_i\left((0,T)\right),\\ u_i=f, & \text{on } A\times(0,T]\,,\\ u_i=c_i, & \text{on } I_i\left((0,T]\right),\\ u_i\left(.,0\right)=u_0, & \text{in } \Omega_i\left(0\right)\ , \end{cases} \tag{4.105}$$

If we have

$$R_0\left\|\kappa_1\nabla u_1\cdot\nu-\kappa_2\nabla u_2\cdot\nu\right\|_{L^2(\Sigma\times(0,T))}\leq\varepsilon\ , \tag{4.106}$$

where $\kappa_i = \kappa(x,t,u_i(x,t)),\ i=1,2,$ then we have, for every $\tau \in (0,T]$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$,

$$\sup_{t\in[\tau,T]} d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1(t)},\overline{\Omega_2(t)}\right) \le R_0 C_1(\tau)\left|\log\varepsilon\right|^{-\frac{1}{C_2(\tau)}} \ , \tag{4.107}$$

where $C_1(\tau)$ and $C_2(\tau)$ are positive constants depending on $\tau, \lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta, R_0^2T^{-1}$ and $F_1(.)$ only.

Proof of Variant I. If $\varepsilon \le \frac{d_0}{R_0}$, where d_0 is defined in Proposition 4.1.8, then we have easily from (4.31), (4.101) and (4.104)

$$|c_1 - c_2| \le F_0\varepsilon. \tag{4.108}$$

By (4.13), (4.103) and (4.104) we have that (4.20) holds true. Now, arguing as in the proof of Proposition 4.1.1 and taking into account (4.108) we have, instead of (4.21),

$$\int_{\Omega_i(t)\setminus G(t)} (u_i(x,t)-c_i)^2\,dx \le R_0^n H^2 \omega\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{H}\right) \ , i=1,2,\ t\in[0,T] \ , \tag{4.109}$$

where ω is an increasing continuous function on $[0,+\infty)$ which satisfies (4.22). Analogously, arguing as in the proof of Proposition 4.1.2 we have that, if $\partial G(t)$ is of Lipschitz class with constants ρ_0, L then (4.109) holds true with ω satisfying (4.23). Concerning Proposition 4.1.3, it is enough to observe that the functions $v_i := u_i - c_i$ are solutions to the equation

$$div\left(\kappa(x,t,v_i+c_i)\nabla v_i\right) - \partial_t v_i = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_i((0,T)), i=1,2,$$

so we have that (4.24) holds true replacing there u by $u_i - c_i$ and $\Omega(t)$ by $\Omega_i(t)$, $i=1,2$, $t\in[0,T]$. With the changes indicated above and proceeding as in the prof of Theorem 4.0.3, (4.107) follows.■

Variant II. Assume that $\{\Omega_i(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$, $\{A_i(t)\}_{t\in[0,T]}$, $\{I_i(t)\}_{t\in[0,T]}$, $i=1,2$ satisfy the same hypotheses of Variant I except for assumption (4.101). Let $f \in C^{2,\beta}(A\times[0,T])$ satisfy $f \in C^{2,\beta}(A\times[0,T])$ satisfy (4.12), (4.13), (4.14) and $f(.,0)=0$ on ∂A. Let $u_i \in C^{2,\beta}(\Omega_i([0,T]))$ be the solution to (4.1) and assume that $u_0 \equiv 0$. If (4.106) is satisfied then we have for any $\tau\in(0,T]$ and $\varepsilon\in(0,1)$

$$\sup_{t\in[\tau,T]} d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1(t)},\overline{\Omega_2(t)}\right) \le R_0 e^{\left(\frac{CH}{F_1(\tau)}\right)^C}\left|\log\varepsilon\right|^{-\frac{1}{C+(F_1(\tau)/H)^{-C}}} \ , \tag{4.110}$$

where C is a positive constant depending on $\tau, \lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta, R_0^2T^{-1}$ and $F_1(.)$ only.

Proof of Variant II. Propositions 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 continue to hold in this case. Concerning Proposition 4.1.3, it is simple to improve inequality (4.24) using in its proof instead of u the trivial extension $\widetilde{u}$. Thus, setting $\rho_1 = \min\{\overline{\rho}, \rho_0\}$, $\sigma_1 = \frac{\eta_1 \rho_1}{6\sqrt{2E+4}}$ we have, instead of (4.86) the inequality

$$\|u(.,\tau)\|_{L^\infty\left(B_{2\rho_0}(y_0)\right)} \leq C_1 \varepsilon^\mu H^{1-\mu} \ , \tag{4.111}$$

where $\mu = \frac{2}{n+2} s_2^m$, $m \leq c_0 M \left(\frac{R_0}{2\sigma_1}\right)^n$ and s_2, $s_2 \in (0,1)$, C_1 depend on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.

In order to apply Proposition 3.4.1 to $\widetilde{u}$ observe that, with the same notation used in the proof of Proposition 4.1.3 and setting $\delta_1 = \frac{\sin\alpha}{\sqrt{2E+1}}$, we have

$$\mathcal{S}\left((0,\tau), e_n, \alpha, \delta_1, R_1\right) \subset \Omega\left((-\infty, \tau]\right) \ .$$

Furthermore, denoting by

$$\alpha_1 = \arcsin\left(\min\left\{\sin\alpha, \delta_1\left(1-\sin\alpha\right)\right\}\right) \ ,$$

$$B(\tau) = \frac{1}{C_2}\left|\log\frac{1-\frac{1}{4}\eta_1 \sin\alpha_1(\tau)}{1+\frac{1}{4}\eta_1\sin\alpha_1(\tau)}\right| \ ,$$

where C_2 depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only, we have, instead of (4.93) the inequality

$$F_1(\tau) \leq H e^{C\left(\frac{R_0}{\overline{\rho}}\right)^{n-1}} \left|\log\left(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{eH}\right)\right|^{-\frac{\overline{\rho}}{CR_0}} \ , \tag{4.112}$$

where C, $C>1$, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only. By (4.112) we have, for every $\overline{\rho} > 0$, $t \in (0,T]$, $z \in (\Omega(t))_{2\overline{\rho}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_{\overline{\rho}}(z)} u^2(x,t)\,dx \\ \geq \quad & H^2 \overline{\rho}^n \exp\left(-e^{\frac{CR_0^n}{\overline{\rho}^n}} \left(\frac{F_1(t)}{H}\right)^{\frac{CR_0}{\overline{\rho}}}\right) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{4.113}$$

where C, $C>1$, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.

In order to prove (4.110) we argue as in the proof of Theorem 4.0.3, in doing this we use (4.113) instead of (4.93) with $\widetilde{u}$ instead of u. We get, instead of (4.34) and (4.35) respectively (σ being defined by (4.33))

$$d_m(t) \leq \frac{CR_0}{b_1(t)} \left(\frac{\sigma}{MH^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\log\frac{C}{b_1(t)}}} \ , \tag{4.114}$$

and

$$d(t) \leq \frac{CR_0}{b_1(t)} \left(\frac{\sigma}{MH^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\log\frac{C}{b_1(t)}}} \ , \tag{4.115}$$

where

$$b_1(t) = \exp\left(-\left(\frac{e^{-1}F_1(t)}{H}\right)^{-C_1}\right) \ , \tag{4.116}$$

and C, $C>1$, C_1 depend on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.

Now, let us denote

$$\widetilde{\psi}(\mu) = \left(e^{-1} F_1 (T_0 \mu)\right)^{-C_1} + \log(Ce) \ , \ \mu \in (0,1]$$

and let $\widetilde{\Psi}_0 = \inf\limits_{(0,1]} \widetilde{\psi}$, notice $\widetilde{\Psi}_0 \geq 1$.
By (4.115) and Proposition 4.1.6 we have

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} d(t) \leq R_0 \left(C e^{\left(\widetilde{\psi}(\mu)\right)} \left(\frac{\sigma}{MH^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{\widetilde{\psi}(\mu)}} + \mu \right) \ , \text{ for every } \mu \in (0,1] \,, \tag{4.117}$$

where C, $C>1$, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.
By (4.117) and Proposition 4.1.1 we have

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} d_{\mathcal{H}} \left(\overline{\Omega_1(t)}, \overline{\Omega_2(t)} \right) \leq R_0 \widetilde{\phi} \left(\frac{1}{M} \left(\log \left| \log \frac{\varepsilon}{H} \right| \right)^{-1/n} \right) \ ,$$

for every $\varepsilon \in \left(0, e^{-1}H\right)$, where

$$\widetilde{\phi}(s) = \left\{ \begin{array}{r} \left(\widetilde{\psi}^{-1} \left(\left| \log\left(\frac{s}{MH^2}\right) \right| \right) \right)^{1/4} + \exp\left(-\widetilde{m}_0 \left| \log\left(\frac{s}{MH^2}\right) \right|^{3/4} \right), \text{ if } s \in (0, \widetilde{a}) \,, \\ C_2 \widetilde{a}^{-1} s \ , \text{ if } s \in [\widetilde{a}, +\infty) \,, \end{array} \right.$$

$\widetilde{a} = e^{-2\widetilde{\Psi}_0} MH^2$, $\widetilde{m}_0 = 1 - \left(2\widetilde{\Psi}_0\right)^{-1/2}$ and C_2 depends on M and E only. Now let us define

$$\widetilde{\varepsilon}_1 = \sup \left\{ \tau \in \left(0, e^{-1}\right) : \widetilde{\phi} \left(\frac{1}{M} \left(\log |\log \tau| \right)^{-1/n} \right) \leq \frac{d_0}{R_0} \right\} \ ,$$

where d_0 is defined in Proposition 4.1.8. From such a Proposition 4.1.8 we have that if $\varepsilon \in (0, \widetilde{\varepsilon}_1 H]$ then there exist $\rho_0 \in (0, R_0]$ and $L > 0$, $\frac{\rho_0}{R_0}$ and L depend on E only, such that $\partial G(t)$ is of Lipschitz class of constants ρ_0, L. Therefore by Proposition 4.1.2 and (4.35) we have

$$d(t) \leq \frac{CR_0}{b_1(t)} \left(C \left| \log \frac{\varepsilon}{H} \right|^{-1/C} \right)^{\frac{1}{\log \frac{C}{b_1(t)}}} \ ,$$

where C, $C>1$, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only. Otherwise, if $\varepsilon > \widetilde{\varepsilon}_1 H$ we have trivially $d(t) \leq C' \frac{\varepsilon}{H \widetilde{\varepsilon}_1}$, where C' depends on E and M only and (4.110) follows.■

Variant III. The stability results stated in Theorem 4.0.3, Variant I and Variant II continue to hold if the first equation in (4.1) is replaced by the equation

$$div \left(\kappa(x,t,u) \nabla u \right) + B(x,t,u,\nabla u) - \partial_t u = 0, \text{ in } \Omega((0,T)) \,, \tag{4.118}$$

where the matrix $\kappa\left(x,t,u\right)$ satisfies the same hypotheses of Theorem 4.0.3 and $B:\mathbb{R}^{2n+2}\rightarrow\mathbb{R}$ satisfies the following conditions

$$B\left(x,t,0,0\right)=0,\text{ for every }\left(x,t\right)\in\mathbb{R}^{n+1}\ ,\tag{4.119}$$

$$R_0^2\left\|\nabla_x B\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n+2})}+R_0^2\left\|\partial_u B\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n+2})}+R_0\left\|\nabla_p B\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n+2})}\leq\Lambda_0\ .\tag{4.120}$$

Proof of Variant III. To obtain the proof of Variant III we need to change the proof of Theorem 4.0.3 only for what concerns the proofs of inequalities (4.66) and (4.73). Actually such inequalities can be achieved multiplying the new equations by $u_1 e^{-\gamma t}$, with γ large enough, and then proceeding in the same way of Propositions 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 .■

Variant IV. If the first equation in (4.1) is replaced by a linear equation then we can get Theorem 4.0.3 and the stability results of Variant I, II under relaxed a priori assumptions. In what follows we will discuss in more detail the case in which the first equation in (4.1) is replaced by the equation

$$div\left(\kappa\left(x,t\right)\nabla u\right)+b\left(x,t\right)\cdot\nabla u+c\left(x,t\right)u-\partial_t u=0,\text{ in }\Omega\left(\left(0,T\right)\right)\ ,\tag{4.121}$$

where $\kappa\left(x,t\right)=\left\{\kappa^{ij}\left(x,t\right)\right\}_{i,j=1}^{n}$ is a symmetric $n\times n$ matrix, $b\left(x,t\right)$ and $c\left(x,t\right)$ are a vector valued measurable function and a measurable function respectively. We assume that $\kappa\left(x,t\right)$ satisfies the following conditions for every $\xi\in\mathbb{R}^n$ and every $\left(x,t\right),\left(y,s\right)\in\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$,

$$\lambda_0\left|\xi\right|^2\leq\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\kappa^{ij}\left(x,t\right)\xi_i\xi_j\leq\lambda_0^{-1}\left|\xi\right|^2\tag{4.122}$$

and

$$\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\left(\kappa^{ij}\left(x,t\right)-\kappa^{ij}\left(y,\tau\right)\right)^2\right)^{1/2}\leq\frac{\Lambda_0}{R_0}\left(\left|x-y\right|^2+\left|t-s\right|\right)^{1/2}\ .\tag{4.123}$$

Concerning $b\left(x,t\right)$ and $c\left(x,t\right)$ we assume that

$$R_0\left\|b\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})}+R_0^2\left\|c\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})}\leq\Lambda_0.\tag{4.124}$$

Assume that $\left\{\Omega_i\left(t\right)\right\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$, $i=1,2$, are two families of domains satisfying (4.2) which (instead of (4.4)), satisfy

$$\partial\Omega_i\left(\left[0,T\right]\right)\text{ is a portion of }\partial\Omega_i\left(\left(-\infty,+\infty\right)\right)\tag{4.125}$$

$$\text{of class }C^{1,1}\text{ with constants }R_0,\ E.$$

For $i=1,2$ and for any $t\in[0,T]$ let $A_i\left(t\right)$, $I_i\left(t\right)$ satisfy (4.3). Assume that, for any $t\in[0,T]$, $A_1\left(t\right)=A_2\left(t\right)=A$ and also (instead of 4.5)

$$A\times\left[0,T\right],\ I\left(\left[0,T\right]\right)\text{ are portions of }\partial\Omega\left(\left(-\infty,+\infty\right)\right)\tag{4.126}$$

of class $C^{1,1}$ with constants R_0, E.

Let $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $f \in H^{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{4}}(A \times (0,T))$ satisfy (instead of (4.8)-(4.13))

$$\|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|f\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{4}}(A\times(0,T))} \leq F_0 \ , \tag{4.127}$$

$$supp f \subset \widetilde{\Sigma} \times [0,T] \ , \tag{4.128}$$

$$\widetilde{F}_1(\tau) \leq \frac{\|f\|_{L^2(A\times(\tau,T))}}{\|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|f\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{4}}(A\times(0,T))}}, \text{ for } \tau \in [0,T], \tag{4.129}$$

where $\widetilde{F}_1(\tau)$ is a given strictly increasing function on $[0,T]$ such that $\widetilde{F}_1(0) = 0$. Let u_i, $i = 1, 2$, be the weak solution to

$$\begin{cases} div(\kappa\nabla u_i) + b\cdot\nabla u_i + cu_i - \partial_t u_i = 0, & \text{in } \Omega_i((0,T)), \\ u_i = f, & \text{on } A\times(0,T], \\ u_i = c_i, & \text{on } I_i((0,T]), \\ u_i(.,0) = u_0, & \text{in } \Omega_i(0) \ , \end{cases}$$

Assume that

$$R_0 \|\kappa\nabla u_1\cdot\nu - \kappa\nabla u_2\cdot\nu\|_{L^2(\Sigma\times(0,T))} \leq \varepsilon \ ,$$

and assume that one of the following conditions is satisfied

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1(0)}, \overline{\Omega_2(0)}\right) \leq R_0\varepsilon$$

or

$$u_0 \equiv 0, \tag{4.130}$$

then we have, for any $\tau \in (0,T]$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$,

$$\sup_{t\in[\tau,T]} d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1(t)}, \overline{\Omega_2(t)}\right) \leq R_0 C_1(\tau) |\log\varepsilon|^{-\frac{1}{C_2(\tau)}} \ ,$$

where $C_1(\tau)$ and $C_2(\tau)$ are positive constants depending on $\tau, \lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta, R_0^2T^{-1}$ and $\widetilde{F}_1(.)$ only. In addition, if (4.130) is satisfied then

$$C_1(\tau) = \exp\frac{C}{\left(\widetilde{F}_1(\tau)\right)^C} \ , \ C_2(\tau) = C + \left(\widetilde{F}_1(\tau)\right)^{-C} \ ,$$

where C, $C > 1$, depends on $\lambda_0, \Lambda_0, E, M, F_0, \beta$ and $R_0^2T^{-1}$ only.

5 Exponential instability

In the present section we prove that the Dirichlet inverse problem studied above is exponentially unstable, that is, the stability estimate for such problem cannot be better than logarithmic. In order to prove this instability property we consider two Dirichlet inverse problems: in the first problem the space dimension

n is equal to 1 and the unknown boundary is a curve $x = s(t)$, in the second problem the unknown boundary is not time varying. Since the second problem has been studied in [53] and it requires more technical proofs than the first one, here we give the detailed proofs for the first problem only.

The common tool used to prove the instability character of the above inverse problems is an abstract theorem of which we give the statement below and refer for the proof to [52].

Let (X, d) be a metric space and let H be a separable Hilbert space with scalar product $(.,.)$. We denote by H' the dual of H and, for any $v \in H$ and any $v\prime \in H'$, we denote by $\langle v', v\rangle$ the duality pairing between v' and v. We denote by $\mathcal{L}(H, H')$ the space of bounded linear operators between H and H' with the usual operator norm. We shall also fix $\gamma : H \smallsetminus \{0\} \to [0, +\infty]$ such that

$$\gamma(\lambda v) = \gamma(v)\,, \text{ for every } v \in H \smallsetminus \{0\} \text{ and } \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \smallsetminus \{0\}\ .$$

Let us remark that the function γ may attain both the values 0 and $+\infty$ and can be thought of as a suitable Rayleigh quotient.

Let F be a function from X to $\mathcal{L}(H, H')$, that is for any $x \in X$, $F(x)$ is a linear and bounded operator between H and H'. We also fix a reference operator $F_0 \in \mathcal{L}(H, H')$ and a reference point $x_0 \in X$ (notice that it is not required any connection between F_0 and $F(x_0)$). For any $\varepsilon > 0$ denote $X_\varepsilon = \{x \in X : d(x, x_0 \leq \varepsilon)\}$.

Definition 5.0.1 *Let (Y, d_Y) be a metric space. Let ε be a positive number. We shall say that a subset W of Y is a ε-discrete set if for any two distinct points $w_1, w_2 \in W$ we have $d_Y(w_1, w_2) \geq \varepsilon$.*

Theorem 5.0.2 *Let us assume that the following conditions are satisfied.*
i) There exist positive constants ε_0, C_1 and α_1 such that for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ there exists an ε-discrete set Z contained in X_ε with at least $\exp(C_1\varepsilon^{-\alpha_1})$ *elements.*
ii) There exist three positive constants p, C_2 and α_2 and an orthonormal basis of H, $\{\psi_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that the following condition hold.

For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that $\gamma(\psi_k) < +\infty$, and for any $q \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\#\{k \in \mathbb{N} : \gamma(\psi_k) \leq q\} \leq C_2(1+q)^p\,, \tag{5.1}$$

where # denotes the number of elements.

For any $x \in X$ and $(k, l) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$|\langle (F(x) - F_0)\psi_k, \psi_l\rangle| \leq C_2 \exp(-\alpha_2 \max\{\gamma(\psi_k), \gamma(\psi_l)\})\,. \tag{5.2}$$

Then there exists a positive constant ε_1, depending on ε_0, C_1, C_2, α_1, α_2 and p only, such that for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$ we can find x_1 and x_2 satisfying

$$x_1, x_2 \in X_\varepsilon\ ,\ d(x_1, x_2) \geq \varepsilon, \tag{5.3}$$

$$\|F(x_1) - F(x_2)\|_{\mathcal{L}(H,H')} \leq 2\exp\left(-\varepsilon^{-\alpha_1/2(p+1)}\right). \tag{5.4}$$

5.1 Exponential instability of the Dirichlet inverse problem with time-varying unknown boundary

We shall use the following Hilbert space. The space $H = H^{\frac{3}{4}}\left(\left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right)\right)$, its dual $H' = H_1 = H^{-\frac{3}{4}}\left(\left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right)\right)$ and $H_0 = H^{\frac{1}{4}}\left(\left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right)\right)$. We consider the interpolation spaces between H_0 and H_1, [113]. For any θ, $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, we define H_θ as $[H_0, H_1]_\theta$, where the latter denotes the interpolation at level θ between H_0 and H_1. The norm in H_0 and H_1 will be denoted by $\|.\|_\theta$. Recall that for any $\theta \in [0,1]$ there exists a constant C_θ, depending on θ only, such that the following interpolation inequality holds true

$$\|\psi\|_\theta \leq C_\theta \|\psi\|_0^{1-\theta} \|\psi\|_1^\theta \text{, for every } \psi \in H_0. \tag{5.5}$$

By using the interpolation properties of fractional order Sobolev spaces, see [113], we can characterize H_θ as follows

$$H_\theta = \begin{cases} H^{\frac{1}{4}-\theta}\left(\left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right)\right), & \text{if } 0 \leq \theta \leq \frac{1}{4}, \\ H^{-\left(\frac{1}{4}-\theta\right)}\left(\left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right)\right), & \text{if } \frac{1}{4} \leq \theta \leq 1,\ \theta \neq \frac{3}{4}. \end{cases} \tag{5.6}$$

Let us notice that the interesting case $\theta = \frac{1}{4}$, where we have $H_\theta = L^2\left(\left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right)\right)$ and that $H_{\frac{3}{4}}$ does not coincide with $H^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(\left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right)\right)$.

Let m be a given positive integer number and let b, δ be positive numbers as above, we define

$$X_{mb\delta} = \begin{array}{l} \left\{ s \in C^m\left(\left[\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right]\right) : \|s\|_{C^m\left(\left[\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right]\right)} \leq b, \right. \\ \left. \quad 1 \leq s \leq 1+\delta,\ s\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) = s\left(\frac{3\pi}{2}\right) = 1 \right\}. \end{array}$$

Let us consider the metric space $(X, d) := (X_{mb\delta}, d_0)$ where $d_0(s_1, s_2) = \|s_1 - s_2\|_{L^\infty\left(\left[\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right]\right)}$.

For any $s \in X$ we denote

$$Q_s = \left\{ (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : t \in \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right),\ 0 < x < s(t) \right\},$$

if $s(t) = s_0(t) = 1$ for every $t \in \left[\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right]$ we set $Q_0 = Q_{s_0}$. Notice that there exists a constant C, $C \geq 1$, such that for any $s_1, s_2 \in X$ we have $C^{-1} d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{Q_{s_1}}, \overline{Q_{s_2}}\right) \leq d_0(s_1, s_2) \leq C^{-1} d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{Q_{s_1}}, \overline{Q_{s_2}}\right)$.
For any $s \in X$ we consider the linear operator $\mathcal{D}_s : H \to H_0$ which is defined as follows. For any $\psi \in H$, let $u \in H^{2,1}(Q_s)$ be the solution to

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \partial_x^2 u = 0, \text{ in } Q_s, \\ u\left(x, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) = 0, \quad \text{for } x \in [0,1], \\ u(s(t), t) = 0, \text{ for } t \in \left[\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right], \\ u(0,t) = \psi(t), \text{ for } t \in \left[\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right], \end{cases} \tag{5.7}$$

then, for any $\psi \in H$, we set

$$\mathcal{D}_s \psi = -\partial_x u(0,t),\ t \in \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right). \tag{5.8}$$

By the trace theorem we have that the linear operator $\mathcal{D}_s$ is bounded. We can also consider $\mathcal{D}_s$ as an operator belonging to $\mathcal{L}(H, H')$, by setting, for any $\psi, \phi \in H$,

$$\langle \mathcal{D}_s \psi, \phi \rangle_{H',H} = \langle -\partial_x u(0, .), \phi \rangle_{H',H} = \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}}^{\frac{3\pi}{2}} -\partial_x u(0, t)\, \phi(t)\, dt, \tag{5.9}$$

where u solves (5.7) and $\langle ., . \rangle_{H',H}$ is the duality pairing between H' and H. We refer to the operator $\mathcal{D}_s$ to as the *Dirichlet-to-Neumann* map.

Theorem 5.1.1 *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and b, $b > 0$, be fixed. Then there exists a positive constant δ_1 depending on m and b only, such that for every $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$ we can find $s_1, s_2 \in X$ satisfying*

$$d_0(s_i, s_0) \leq \delta,\ i = 1, 2;\ d_0(s_1, s_2) \geq \delta \tag{5.10}$$

and for any $\theta \in [0, 1]$

$$\|\mathcal{D}_{s_1} - \mathcal{D}_{s_2}\|_{\mathcal{L}(H, H_\theta)} \leq C \exp\left(-\theta \delta^{-\frac{1}{6m}}\right), \tag{5.11}$$

where C is a constant depending on m, b and θ only.

In order to prove Theorem 5.1.1, we need to introduce some notation. For any $s \in X$ let $\widetilde{s}$ be its extension to 1 to $[0, 2\pi]$ and denote $\widetilde{Q}_s = \left\{(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : t \in (0, 2\pi),\ 0 < x < \widetilde{s}(t)\right\}$. Let us consider the Hilbert space $L^2((0, 2\pi))$ endowed with the scalar product

$$(\psi, \phi)_0 = \int_0^{2\pi} \psi(t)\, \phi(t)\, dt, \text{ for any } \psi, \phi \in L^2((0, 2\pi)).$$

We have that the set

$$\left\{\psi_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sin\left(\frac{n}{2} t\right) : n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}, \tag{5.12}$$

is an orthonormal basis of $L^2((0, 2\pi))$ with respect to the scalar product $(., .)_0$.

For any $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ consider the Sobolev space $H^\sigma_{,0}((0, 2\pi))$. We have the following properties. First, $H^\sigma_{,0}((0, 2\pi)) = H^\sigma((0, 2\pi))$ if and only if $\sigma \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Then, for any $\sigma \neq \frac{1}{2}$ we can endow $H^\sigma((0, 2\pi))$ with the following scalar product

$$(\psi, \phi)_\sigma = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(1 + \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{2\sigma}\right) (\psi, \psi_n)_0\, (\phi, \psi_n)_0\ \text{, for every } \psi, \phi \in H^\sigma((0, 2\pi)),$$

with respect to which the set

$$\left\{\widetilde{\psi}_n = \frac{\psi_n}{\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{2\sigma}}} : n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}, \tag{5.13}$$

is an othonormal basis of $H^{\sigma}_{,0}((0,2\pi))$.We define $\gamma : \widetilde{H} \setminus \{0\} \to [0,+\infty]$, such that

$$\gamma\left(\widetilde{\psi}\right) = \frac{\left\|\widetilde{\psi}\right\|_{\widetilde{H}}}{\left\|\widetilde{\psi}\right\|_{\widetilde{H}_0}}, \text{ for every } \widetilde{\psi} \in \widetilde{H} \setminus \{0\},$$

Notice that

$$\gamma\left(\widetilde{\psi}_n\right) = \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}\ , \text{ for every } n \in \mathbb{N}$$

and let us call for every positive integer q, $N_1(q) = \#\left\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \gamma\left(\widetilde{\psi}_n\right) \leq q\right\}$. We have

$$N_1(q) \leq 2(1+q)^2\ , \text{ for every } q \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{5.14}$$

Let $\widetilde{H} = H^{\frac{3}{4}}_{,0}((0,2\pi))$, $\widetilde{H}' = \widetilde{H}_1 = H^{-\frac{3}{4}}((0,2\pi))$ and $\widetilde{H}_0 = H^{\frac{1}{4}}((0,2\pi))$. For any $s \in X$, let us define in the same way as before the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map associated to $\widetilde{Q}_s$, that is the linear and bounded operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_s : \widetilde{H} \to \widetilde{H}_0$ such that $\widetilde{\psi} \in \widetilde{H}$, we set

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_s\widetilde{\psi} = -\partial_x\widetilde{u}(0,t)\ ,\ t \in (0,2\pi)\ ,$$

where $\widetilde{u}$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t\widetilde{u} - \partial_x^2\widetilde{u} = 0, \text{ in } \widetilde{Q}_s, \\ \widetilde{u}(x,0) = 0, \quad \text{ for } x \in [0,1]\ , \\ \widetilde{u}(\widetilde{s}(t),t) = 0, \text{ for } t \in [0,2\pi]\ , \\ \widetilde{u}(0,t) = \widetilde{\psi}(t)\ , \text{ for } t \in [0,2\pi]\ . \end{cases} \tag{5.15}$$

Let us also define the following two linear and bounded operators $\widetilde{G}, \widetilde{G}^* : \widetilde{H} \to \widetilde{H}$ such that for any $\widetilde{\psi} \in \widetilde{H}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\widetilde{G}\widetilde{\psi}\right)(t) &= \widetilde{\psi}(t)\, e^{-1/t}t^{-3/2}, \\ \left(\widetilde{G}^*\widetilde{\psi}\right)(t) &= \widetilde{\psi}(t)\, e^{-1/(2\pi-t)}(2\pi-t)^{-3/2}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

We have that there exists a constant C_1 such that

$$\left\|\widetilde{G}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}\left(\widetilde{H},\widetilde{H}\right)}, \left\|\widetilde{G}^*\right\|_{\mathcal{L}\left(\widetilde{H},\widetilde{H}\right)} \leq C_1. \tag{5.17}$$

For any $s \in X$, we define the following linear and bounded operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s} : \widetilde{H} \to \widetilde{H}'$ as follows

$$\left\langle \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s}\widetilde{\psi}, \widetilde{\phi} \right\rangle_{\widetilde{H}',\widetilde{H}} = \left\langle \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_s\widetilde{G}\widetilde{\psi}, \widetilde{G}^*\widetilde{\phi} \right\rangle_{\widetilde{H}',\widetilde{H}}, \text{ for any } \widetilde{\psi}, \widetilde{\phi} \in \widetilde{H}. \tag{5.18}$$

The proof of Theorem 5.1.1 is an immediate consequence of the following two propositions whose proofs we postpone for a while.

Proposition 5.1.2 *There exists a constant C_2, depending on m and b only, such that for any $s \in X$ and any $\widetilde{\psi} \in \widetilde{H}$ we have*

$$\left\| \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_s - \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{s_0} \right) \widetilde{\psi} \right\|_{\widetilde{H}_0} \leq C_2 \left\| \widetilde{u}_0 \right\|_{H^{2,1}((0,1/2)\times(0,2\pi))} , \tag{5.19}$$

where $\widetilde{u}_0$ solves (5.15) with $s = s_0$.

Proposition 5.1.3 *There exists a positive constant δ_1, depending on m and b only, such that for any $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$ we can find $s_1, s_2 \in X$ satisfying (5.10) such that*

$$\left\| \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s_1} - \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s_2} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}\left(\widetilde{H}, \widetilde{H}'\right)} \leq 2 \exp\left(-\delta^{-\frac{1}{6m}} \right) \ . \tag{5.20}$$

Proof of Theorem 5.1.1. By the trace inequality and standard estimates for parabolic equations we have, for any $\widetilde{\psi} \in \widetilde{H}$,

$$\left\| \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{s_0} \widetilde{\psi} \right\|_{\widetilde{H}_0} \leq C_3 \left\| \widetilde{\psi} \right\|_{\widetilde{H}} \ , \tag{5.21}$$

where C_3 depends on m and b only.
By Proposition 5.1.2 and by (5.21) we have

$$\left\| \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_s \right\|_{\mathcal{L}\left(\widetilde{H}, \widetilde{H}_0\right)} \leq C_4, \text{ for every } s \in X, \tag{5.22}$$

where C_4 depends on m and b only.

Now, for any $\psi \in H$, let $\widetilde{\psi} \leq \widetilde{H}$ be its extension to 0 to $(0, 2\pi) \setminus (\pi/2, 3\pi/2)$. We have that $J : H \to \widetilde{H}$, where $J\left(\widetilde{\psi}\right) = \psi$ for any $\psi \in H$, is a linear isometry. Furthermore, we have that the linear operators $G, G^* : H \to H$ such that

$$G(\psi) = \widetilde{G}\left(\widetilde{\psi}\right)_{|(\pi/2,3\pi/2)} \ , \ G^*(\psi) = \widetilde{G}^*\left(\widetilde{\psi}\right)_{|(\pi/2,3\pi/2)} \ ,$$

are invertible and

$$\|G\|_{\mathcal{L}(H,H)} \ , \ \|G^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(H,H)} \ , \ \left\|G^{-1}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}(H,H)} \ , \ \left\|(G^*)^{-1}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}(H,H)} \leq C_5, \tag{5.23}$$

where C_5 is a constant.
For any $s \in X$ and for any $\psi, \phi \in H$, we have

$$\mathcal{D}_s \psi = \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_s \widetilde{\psi}_{|(\pi/2,3\pi/2)} \tag{5.24}$$

and

$$\langle \mathcal{D}_s \psi, \phi \rangle_{H',H} = \left\langle \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_s J \widetilde{\psi}, J \widetilde{\phi} \right\rangle_{\widetilde{H}',\widetilde{H}} = \left\langle \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s} J G^{-1} \widetilde{\psi}, J\left(G^*\right)^{-1} \widetilde{\phi} \right\rangle_{\widetilde{H}',\widetilde{H}} . \tag{5.25}$$

By (5.22) and (5.24) we have

$$\left\| \mathcal{D}_{s_1} - \mathcal{D}_{s_2} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(H,H_0)} \leq 2C_4, \text{ for every } s_1, s_2 \in X. \tag{5.26}$$

By (5.23) and (5.25) we derive that, for every $s_1, s_2 \in X$, we have

$$\left\| \mathcal{D}_{s_1} - \mathcal{D}_{s_2} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(H,H')} \leq C_5^2 \left\| \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s_1} - \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s_2} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}\left(\widetilde{H},\widetilde{H}'\right)} . \tag{5.27}$$

By Proposition 5.1.3, (5.26), (5.27) and interpolation inequality (5.5) Theorem 5.1.1 follows.■

Proof of Proposition 5.1.2. Let $\chi \in C^{\infty}([0,+\infty))$ be a function such that $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$, $\chi(x) = 0$, for $x \in \left[0, \frac{1}{4}\right]$ and $\chi(x) = 1$, for $x \in \left[\frac{1}{2}, +\infty\right)$. Let $v = \widetilde{u} - (1-\chi)\widetilde{u}_0$, where $\widetilde{u}$ is the solution to (5.15). We have

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v - \partial_x^2 v = f, \text{ in } \widetilde{Q}_s, \\ v(x,0) = 0, \quad \text{for } x \in [0,1], \\ v(\widetilde{s}(t), t) = 0, \text{ for } t \in [0,2\pi], \\ v(0,t) = 0, \text{ for } t \in [0,2\pi], \end{cases} \tag{5.28}$$

where $f = -\chi''\widetilde{u}_0 - 2\chi'\widetilde{u}_0'$. Since $supp\, f \subset \left[\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}\right]$ we have, for a constant C_6,

$$\|f\|_{L^2\left(\widetilde{Q}_s\right)} \leq C_6 \|\widetilde{u}_0\|_{H^{2,1}((0,1/2)\times(0,2\pi))} . \tag{5.29}$$

Now denote by w, f_1 the functions defined as follows

$$w(\xi,t) = v(\xi\widetilde{s}(t), t) \ , \ f_1(\xi,t) = f(\xi\widetilde{s}(t),t) \ , \text{ for every } (\xi,t) \in [0,1]\times[0,2\pi] .$$

We have that w solves the following problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t w - \left(\frac{1}{\widetilde{s}^2(t)} \partial_\xi^2 w + \frac{\xi \widetilde{s}'(t)}{\widetilde{s}(t)} \partial_\xi w \right) = f_1, \text{ in } (0,1)\times(0,2\pi), \\ w(\xi,0) = 0, \quad \text{for } \xi \in [0,1], \\ w(1,t) = 0, \text{ for } t \in [0,2\pi], \\ w(0,t) = 0, \text{ for } t \in [0,2\pi], \end{cases}$$

Therefore, by standard regularity estimates for parabolic equations, (5.29) and a simple change of variable we have

$$\|w\|_{H^{2,1}((0,1)\times(0,2\pi))} \leq C_8 \|f\|_{L^2\left(\widetilde{Q}_s\right)} , \tag{5.30}$$

where C_8 depends on b and m only.
On the other side, for every $t \in (0,2\pi)$ we have

$$\partial_\xi w(0,t) = -\widetilde{s}(t)\,\partial_x v(0,t) = -\widetilde{s}(t)\left(\partial_x \widetilde{u} - \partial_x u_0\right)(0,t) = \widetilde{s}(t)\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_s \widetilde{\psi} - \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{s_0}\widetilde{\psi}\right)(0,t),$$

hence

$$\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_s \widetilde{\psi} - \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{s_0}\widetilde{\psi}\right)(0,t) = -\frac{1}{\widetilde{s}(t)} \partial_\xi w(0,t) \tag{5.31}$$

and by the trace theorem there exists a constant C_9 such that

$$\|\partial_\xi w(0,.)\|_{\widetilde{H}_0} \leq C_9 \|w\|_{H^{2,1}((0,1)\times(0,2\pi))} .$$

By the just obtained inequality (5.29), (5.30) and (5.31) we get (5.19).■

In order to prove Proposition 5.1.3 we need further auxiliary propositions and new notation. The following proposition has been proved in [116]. Let us fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and a positive numer b. Let ε be a fixed positive number, we denote by X_ε the set $\{s \in X : d_0 (s, s_0) \leq \varepsilon\}$. Notice that $X_\varepsilon = X_{mb\varepsilon}$.

Proposition 5.1.4 *There exists a positive constant ε_0, depending on m and b only, such that for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ there exists $W \subset X_\varepsilon$ satifying the following properties. W is ε-discrete with respect to the distance d_0 and W has at least $\exp\left(2^{-1}\varepsilon_0^{\frac{1}{m}}\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{m}}\right)$ elements.*

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ denote

$$y_n(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-1/t} t^{-3/2} \sin\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) t, \text{ if } t > 0, \\ 0, \text{ if } t \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Notice that $y_n \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $y_n \in H^m(\mathbb{R})$ for any $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let U_n be the solution to the following boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t U_n - \partial_x^2 U_n = 0, \text{ in } (0,1) \times (0, +\infty), \\ U_n(x,t) = 0, \text{ in } [0,1] \times (-\infty, 0], \\ U_n(1,t) = y_n(t), \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{R}, \\ U_n(0,t) = 0, \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases} \tag{5.32}$$

The following decay estimate of exponential type will be crucial.

Proposition 5.1.5 *For any fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let U_n solve (5.32). Let us fix $\rho_0 \in (0,1)$. Then there exist positive constants K_1 and k_1 depending on ρ_0 only, such that*

$$\|U_n\|_{L^2\left(B_{\rho_0} \times \mathbb{R}\right)} \leq K_1 \exp\left(-k_1 \gamma\left(\widetilde{\psi}_n\right)\right). \tag{5.33}$$

Proof. Let us denote

$$\widehat{U}_n(x,\xi) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-i\xi t} U_n(x,t)\, dt \ ,$$

$$\widehat{y}_n(\xi) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-i\xi t} y_n(t)\, dt.$$

By (5.32) we get

$$\begin{cases} \partial_x^2 \widehat{U}_n - i\xi \widehat{U}_n = 0, \text{ in } (0,1) \times \mathbb{R}, \\ \widehat{U}_n(1,\xi) = \widehat{y}_n(\xi), \text{ for } \xi \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \widehat{U}_n(0,\xi) = 0, \text{ for } \xi \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases} \tag{5.34}$$

Therefore

$$\widehat{U}_n\left(x,\xi\right)=\widehat{y}_n\left(\xi\right)\frac{\sinh\sigma\left(1-x\right)}{\sinh\sigma}, \tag{5.35}$$

where $\sigma=\sqrt{\frac{|\xi|}{2}}\left(i-\text{sign}\xi\right)$. Notice that $\sigma^2=i\xi$. Hence there exists a constant C such that

$$\left|\widehat{U}_n\left(x,\xi\right)\right|=C\left|\widehat{y}_n\left(\xi\right)\right|e^{-x\sqrt{\frac{|\xi|}{2}}} \tag{5.36}$$

By using classical tables of integral transforms, see for instance [56], we have that, for any $\xi\in\mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{y}_n\left(\xi\right) \quad = \quad & \frac{e^{-\sqrt{2|\xi-n/2|}}}{2i}\left(\cos\left(\sqrt{2\left|\xi-n/2\right|}\right)-\text{sign}\left(\xi-n/2\right)i\sin\left(\sqrt{2\left|\xi-n/2\right|}\right)\right)\\ & -\frac{e^{-\sqrt{2|\xi+n/2|}}}{2i}\left(\cos\left(\sqrt{2\left|\xi+n/2\right|}\right)-\text{sign}\left(\xi+n/2\right)i\sin\left(\sqrt{2\left|\xi+n/2\right|}\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

hence the following estimate holds true

$$\left|\widehat{y}_n\left(\xi\right)\right|\leq e^{-\sqrt{2|\xi-n/2|}}+e^{-\sqrt{2|\xi+n/2|}},\text{ for every }\xi\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{5.37}$$

By Plancherel Theorem, (5.36) and (5.37) we have, for any $\rho_0\in(0,1)$ and for any $n\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\int_{(0,\rho_0)\times(0,+\infty)}\left|U\left(x,t\right)\right|^2dxdt=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{\rho_0}dx\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\widehat{U}_n\left(x,\xi\right)\right|^2d\xi$$

$$\leq C\int_0^{\rho_0}dx\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\widehat{y}_n\left(\xi\right)\right|^2e^{\sqrt{2|\xi|}x}d\xi\leq C\rho_0\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}e^{-2\sqrt{2|\xi-n/2|}}e^{\sqrt{2|\xi|}\rho_0}d\xi$$

$$C\rho_0\left(\int_{|\xi|\leq n/4}e^{-2\sqrt{2|\xi-n/2|}}e^{\sqrt{2|\xi|}\rho_0}d\xi+\int_{|\xi|\geq n/4}e^{-2\sqrt{2|\xi-n/2|}}e^{\sqrt{2|\xi|}\rho_0}d\xi\right)\leq K_1e^{-k_1\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}},$$

where K_1, k_1 depend on ρ_0 only. Recalling that $\gamma\left(\widetilde{\psi}_n\right)=\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}$, for every $n\in\mathbb{N}$, by the inequality proved above we get (5.33).$\blacksquare$

Lemma 5.1.6 *There exist positive constants K_2 and k_2 depending on m and b only, such that for any $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and any $s\in X$, we have*

$$\left\|\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s}-\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s_0}\right)\widetilde{\psi}_n\right\|_{\widetilde{H}'}\leq K_2\exp\left(-k_2\gamma\left(\widetilde{\psi}_n\right)\right). \tag{5.38}$$

Proof. By (5.17) and (5.18) we have

$$\left\|\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s}-\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s_0}\right)\widetilde{\psi}_n\right\|_{\widetilde{H}'}\leq C_1\left\|\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_s-\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{s_0}\right)\widetilde{G}\widetilde{\psi}_n\right\|_{\widetilde{H}'}. \tag{5.39}$$

Let U_n solve (5.32). Then the restriction of U_n to the time interval $(0, 2\pi)$ solves (5.15) with $s = s_0$ and boundary data at $x = 0$ and $x = 1$ equal respectively to $\widetilde{G}\widetilde{\psi}_n$ and 0. Therefore, by Proposition 5.1.2 and (5.39), we have

$$\left\| \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s} - \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s_0} \right) \widetilde{\psi}_n \right\|_{\widetilde{H}'} \leq K_3 \left\| U_n \right\|_{H^{2,1}\left(\left(0,\frac{1}{2}\right)\times(0,2\pi)\right)} .$$

Then the conclusion follows by Proposition 5.1.5 and a Caccioppoli type inequality of the form

$$\left\| U_n \right\|_{H^{2,1}((0,\rho_1)\times(0,2\pi))} \leq K_4 \left\| U_n \right\|_{L^2((0,\rho_0)\times(0,2\pi))} ,$$

where $0 < \rho_1 < \rho_0 < 1$ and K_4 depends on ρ_0 and ρ_1 only. For similar Caccioppoli type inequalities we refer to Section 6, Chapter III, of [104].■

Proof of Proposition 5.1.3. First we introduce the operator which is the adjoint to $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s}$. For any $s \in X$, let us define the linear and bounded operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_s^* : \widetilde{H} \to \widetilde{H}_0$ such that for any $\widetilde{\phi} \in \widetilde{H}$, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_s^* \widetilde{\phi} = -\partial_x \widetilde{v}\,(0,t) \ ,$$

where $\widetilde{v}$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \widetilde{v} + \partial_x^2 \widetilde{v} = 0, \text{ in } \widetilde{Q}_s, \\ \widetilde{v}\,(x, 2\pi) = 0, \quad \text{ for } x \in [0,1]\,, \\ \widetilde{v}\,(\widetilde{s}\,(t)\,, t) = 0, \text{ for } t \in [0, 2\pi]\,, \\ \widetilde{v}\,(0,t) = \widetilde{\phi}, \text{ for } t \in [0, 2\pi]\,. \end{cases} \tag{5.40}$$

Then we define $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s}^* : \widetilde{H} \to \widetilde{H}'$ so that

$$\left\langle \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s}^* \widetilde{\phi}, \widetilde{\psi} \right\rangle_{\widetilde{H}',\widetilde{H}} = \left\langle \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_s^* \widetilde{G}^* \widetilde{\phi}, \widetilde{G}\widetilde{\psi} \right\rangle_{\widetilde{H}',\widetilde{H}} \ , \text{ for every } \widetilde{\phi}, \widetilde{\psi} \in \widetilde{H}.$$

By using the weak formulation of (5.15) and (5.40) it is easy to show that the following adjointness property holds true for any $s \in X$

$$\left\langle \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s} \widetilde{\psi}, \widetilde{\phi} \right\rangle_{\widetilde{H}',\widetilde{H}} = \left\langle \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s}^* \widetilde{\phi}, \widetilde{\psi} \right\rangle_{\widetilde{H}',\widetilde{H}} \ , \text{ for every } \widetilde{\psi}, \widetilde{\phi} \in \widetilde{H}. \tag{5.41}$$

It is not difficult to show that, by the change of variable in time, (5.38) holds true if we replace there $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s}$ with $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s}^*$. Therefore,using (5.39), we have

$$\left| \left\langle \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s} - \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{1,s_0} \right) \widetilde{\psi}_n, \widetilde{\psi}_{n'} \right\rangle_{\widetilde{H}',\widetilde{H}} \right| \leq K_5 \exp\left(-k_2 \max\left\{ \gamma\left(\widetilde{\psi}_n\right), \gamma\left(\widetilde{\psi}_{n'}\right) \right\} \right), \tag{5.42}$$

where K_5 depends on m and b only.

Finally, recalling Proposition 5.1.4, the inequality (5.14) and the decay estimate (5.42) we notice that we are exactly in the position of applying Theorem 5.0.2 and Proposition 5.1.3 follows.■

5.2 Stability properties of the Dirichlet inverse problem with unknown boundary independent on time

In this section, for the reader's convenience, first we present the formulation of the Dirichlet inverse problem when the unknown boundary is independent on time and the equation is linear, then we state, without proofs, the stability properties (i.e. stability estimate and exponential instability) for such a problem. Such a proof has the same structure of the proof of Theorem 5.1.1 but it presents additional difficulties with respect to this Theorem. For the more details we refer to [53].

Referring to the problem formulated at beginning of Section 4, in this section $\Omega(t) = \Omega$ and $I(t) = I$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, where Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with a sufficiently smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ and I is an inaccessible part of $\partial\Omega$. Given a nontrivial function f on $A\times(0,T)$, let us consider the following Cauchy-Dirichlet (direct) problem

$$\begin{cases} div\left(\kappa\left(x,t\right)\nabla u\right) - \partial_t u = 0, & \text{in } \Omega\times(0,T), \\ u = f, & \text{on } A\times(0,T], \\ u = 0, & \text{on } I\times(0,T], \\ u(.,0) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{5.43}$$

where $\kappa(x,t) = \left\{\kappa^{ij}(x,t)\right\}_{i,j=1}^{n}$ denotes a known symmetric matrix which satisfies a hypothesis of uniform ellipticity and some smothness conditions that we shall specify below.

Given an open portion Σ of $\partial\Omega$ such that $\Sigma \subset A$, we consider the inverse problem of determinig I, from the knowledge of $\kappa(x,t)\nabla u\cdot\nu$ on $\Sigma\times[0,T]$.

Let λ_0, Λ_0, E, M, R_0, $\widetilde{F}$ and β be given positive numbers with $\lambda_0, \beta \in (0,1]$.

i) A priori information on the domain Ω.

We assume

$$|\Omega| \leq M R_0^n. \tag{5.44}$$

Concerning the regularity of $\partial\Omega$ we assume that

$$\partial\Omega \text{ is of } C^{0,1} \text{ class a with constants } R_0,\ E. \tag{5.45}$$

In addition we assume that there exist open portions Σ, $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ within A such that $\Sigma \subset \widetilde{\Sigma}$ and there exists a point $P_0 \in \Sigma$ such that

$$\partial\Omega \cap B_{R_0}(P_0) \subset \Sigma\ , \tag{5.46}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\Sigma} \cap (I)^{R_0} = \varnothing\ . \tag{5.47}$$

and

$$I \cup A = \partial\Omega\ ,\ \mathrm{Int} I \cap \mathrm{Int}(A) = \varnothing\ ,\ I \cap A = \partial A = \partial I\ . \tag{5.48}$$

Recall that interior and boundaries are intented in the relative topology of $\partial\Omega$.

ii) A priori information on the unknown part of the boundary. We suppose that we have

$$I \text{ is of } C^{1,\beta} \text{ class with constant } R_0,\, E. \tag{5.49}$$

iii) A priori information about prescribed boundary datum.
We shall assume that

$$f \in H^{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{4}}\left(A \times (0,T)\right), \tag{5.50}$$

$$suppf \subset \widetilde{\Sigma} \tag{5.51}$$

and

$$\frac{\|f\|_{H^{1/2,1/4}(A\times(0,T))}}{\|f\|_{L^2(A\times(0,T))}} \leq \widetilde{F}. \tag{5.52}$$

iii) Assumptions about the thermal conductivity κ.
The thermal conductivity κ is assumed to be a given function from $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ with values in $n \times n$ matrices satisfying the following conditions. When $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $(x,s), (y,\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ we assume that

$$\lambda_0 |\xi|^2 \leq \kappa(x,t)\,\xi \cdot \xi \leq \lambda_0^{-1} |\xi|^2, \tag{5.53}$$

$$|\kappa(x,t) - \kappa(y,\tau)| \leq \Lambda_0 \left(\frac{|x-y|}{R_0} + \frac{|t-s|}{R_0} \right). \tag{5.54}$$

In the next theorem we shall use the following notation

$$W(\Omega \times (0,T)) = \left\{ v : v \in L^2\left((0,T); H^1(\Omega)\right), \partial_t v \in L^2\left((0,T); H^{-1}(\Omega)\right) \right\}.$$

Theorem 5.2.1 *Let Ω_1, Ω_2 be domains satisfying (5.44) (5.45). For any $i = 1,2$ let A_i, I_i satisfying (5.48), be the accessible and inaccessible part of $\partial\Omega_i$ respectively. Assume that $A_1 = A_2 = A$ and that Ω_1 and Ω_2 lie on the same side of A. Let us take Σ, $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ within A such that $\Sigma \subset \widetilde{\Sigma}$ satisfying (5.46) (5.47). Finally, we suppose that, for any $i = 1,2$, I_i satisfies the a priori information (5.49).*

Let us assume that (5.50), (5.51), (5.52), (5.53) and (5.54) are also satisfied and let $u_i \in W(\Omega_i \times (0,T))$ be the weak solution to (5.43) when $\Omega = \Omega_i$, $i = 1,2$. If, given $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$R_0 \|k\nabla u_1 \cdot \nu - k\nabla u_2 \cdot \nu\|_{L^2(\Sigma\times(0,T))} \leq \varepsilon \;, \tag{5.55}$$

then we have, for every $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$,

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\overline{\Omega_1}, \overline{\Omega_2}\right) \leq R_0 C_1 |\log \varepsilon|^{-\frac{1}{C_2}} \;, \tag{5.56}$$

where C_1, C_2 are positive constants depending on λ_0, Λ_0, E, M, R_0, $\widetilde{F}$, β and $R_0^2 T^{-1}$ only.

In order to analyse the instability of the inverse problem we study what happens in the most favourable situation, that is we suppose to have strong a priori information on I, A and κ as simple as possible. In addition we take into account all possible measurements.

More precisely in the instability analysis we deal within the following framework. Let us assume $\Omega = B_1 \smallsetminus D$ where D is a compact subset of B_1 (D represents an unknown cavity). Let $A = \partial B_1$, $I = \partial D$. We also set $\Sigma = \widetilde{\Sigma} = A$. We set $Q = B_1 \times \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right)$ and $\Gamma = A \times \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right)$. In addition we assume that κ is equal to the identity matrix. Let us fix a positive integer m. To each C^m regular cavity D we associate its Dirichlet-to-Neumann map $\mathcal{D}_D$, that is the operator that maps each prescribed temperature f on $A \times \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right)$ into the corresponding heat flux $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}_{|A \times \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right)}$. We shall give below a formal definition of $\mathcal{D}_D$.

We shall use the following Hibert space. The space $H = H^{\frac{3}{2},\frac{3}{4}}_{,0}(\Gamma)$, its dual $H' = H_1 = H^{-\frac{3}{2},-\frac{3}{4}}(\Gamma)$ and $H_0 = H^{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{4}}(\Gamma)$. We consider the interpolation spaces between H_0 and H_1, [113]. For any θ, $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, we define H_θ as $[H_0, H_1]_\theta$, where the latter denotes the interpolation at level θ between H_0 and H_1. By using the interpolation properties of fractional order Sobolev spaces, see [113], we can characterize H_θ as follows

$$H_\theta = \begin{cases} H^{2\left(\frac{1}{4}-\theta\right),\frac{1}{4}-\theta}\left(\left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right)\right), & \text{if } 0 \leq \theta \leq \frac{1}{4}, \\ H^{-2\left(\frac{1}{4}-\theta\right),-\left(\frac{1}{4}-\theta\right)}\left(\left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right)\right), & \text{if } \frac{1}{4} \leq \theta \leq 1,\ \theta \neq \frac{3}{4}. \end{cases}$$

Let us notice that the interesting case $\theta = \frac{1}{4}$, where we have $H_\theta = L^2(\Gamma)$ and that $H_{\frac{3}{4}}$ do not coincide with $H^{-1,-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$.

Let us fix an integer $m \geq 2$ and positive constants δ, b and r.

For a strictly positive function g defined on ∂B_1 we recall the definition of its radial subgraph,

$$\text{subgraph}_{rad}(g) = \left\{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : y = \rho\omega,\ 0 \leq \rho \leq g(r\omega),\ \omega \in \partial B_1\right\}.$$

Then we define

$$\begin{aligned} X_{mb\delta}\left(\overline{B}_r\right) \quad = \quad & \{\text{subgraph}_{rad}(g) : g \in C^\infty(\partial B_r), \\ & \|g\|_{C^m(\partial B_r)} \leq b \text{ and } r \leq g \leq r + \delta\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider the metric space $(X, d) = \left(X_{mb\frac{1}{4}}\left(\overline{B}_{1/2}\right), d_{\mathcal{H}}\right)$, where $d_{\mathcal{H}}$ denotes the Hausdorff distance. Let us notice that every $D \in X$ is closed, is starshaped with respect to the origin and satisfies $\overline{B}_{1/2} \subset D \subset \overline{B}_{3/4}$.

For any $D \in X$, we set $Q(D) = (B_1 \smallsetminus D) \times \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right)$, $\Gamma(D) = \partial D \times \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right)$. If $D = \emptyset$ then we set $Q(D) = Q$ and $\Gamma(D) = \emptyset$.

For any $D \in X \cup \{\emptyset\}$, we consider the operator $\mathcal{D}_D : H \to H_0$ which is defined as follows. For any $\psi \in H$, let $u \in H^{2,1}(Q(D))$ be the solution to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u - \partial_t u = 0, & \text{in } Q(D), \\ u = \psi, & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \Gamma(D), \\ u\left(., \frac{\pi}{2}\right) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega \setminus D \ , \end{cases} \tag{5.57}$$

Then, for any $\psi \in H$, we set

$$\mathcal{D}_D \psi = \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}_{|\Gamma} \text{ , } u \text{ solution to (5.57).}$$

We have that Theorems 4.3 and 6.2 in Chapter 4 of [113] imply, respectively, existence and uniqueness of a solution $u \in H^{2,1}(Q(D))$ to (5.57) and its continuous dependence from the boundary datum $\psi \in H$. In addition, by trace theorem (Chapter 4 Theorem 2.1 of [113]) we can conclude that, for any $D \in X \cup \{\emptyset\}$ the operator $\mathcal{D}_D : H \to H_0$ is linear and bounded. We can also consider $\mathcal{D}_D$ as an operator belonging to $\mathcal{L}(H, H')$, by setting, for any $\psi, \phi \in H$,

$$\langle \mathcal{D}_D \psi, \phi \rangle_{H',H} = \left\langle \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}_{|\Gamma}, \phi \right\rangle_{H',H} = \int_\Gamma \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} \phi dS,$$

where u solves (5.57) and $\langle ., . \rangle_{H',H}$ is the duality pairing between H' and H.

Theorem 5.2.2 *Let us fix an integer $m \geq 2$ and a positive constant b. Let $(X, d) = \left(X_{mb^{\frac{1}{4}}}\left(\overline{B}_{1/2}\right), d_{\mathcal{H}}\right)$. Then there exists a positive constant $\overline{\delta}$, depending on m and b only, such that for every $\delta \in \left(0, \overline{\delta}\right)$ we can find $D_1, D_2 \in X$ satisfying*

$$d\left(D_i, \overline{B}_{1/2}\right) \leq \delta, \text{ for any } i = 1, 2; \ d(D_1, D_2) \geq \delta$$

and for any $\theta \in [0, 1]$

$$\|\mathcal{D}_{D_1} - \mathcal{D}_{D_2}\|_{\mathcal{L}(H, H_\theta)} \leq C \exp\left(-\theta \delta^{-\frac{1}{6m}}\right),$$

where C is a constant depending on m, b and θ only.

Acknowledgments. I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Elena Beretta and Professor Edi Rosset for useful and stimulating discussion about the problem.

References

[1] V. Adolfsson, L. Escauriaza, $C^{1,\alpha}$ *domains and unique continuation at the boundary*, Comm.Pure Appl. Math. **L**, (1997), 935-969.

[2] V. Adolfsson, L. Escauriaza, C. Kenig, *Convex domains and unique continuation at the boundary*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana 11 (1995), no. 3, 513–525.

[3] G. Alessandrini, *Examples of instability in inverse boundary-value problems*, Inverse Problems 13, (1997), 887-897.

[4] G. Alessandrini, L. Rondi, *Optimal stability for the inverse problem of multiple cavities,* J. Differ. Equ. 176, (2), (2001), 356-386.

[5] G. Alessandrini, E. Beretta, E. Rosset, S. Vessella, *Optimal stability for inverse elliptic boundary value problems with unknown boundaries*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4), XXIX, (2000), 755-806.

[6] G. Alessandrini, E. Beretta, E. Rosset, S. Vessella, *Inverse boundary value problems with unknown boundaries: Optimal stability*, C. R. Acad Sci. Paris t. 328, Série II b, (2000), 607-611.

[7] G. Alessandrini, S. Vessella, *Local behaviour of solutions to parabolic equations*, Comm. Part. Diff. Equat. 13, (1988), 1041-1058.

[8] G. Alessandrini, S. Vessella, *Remark on the strong unique continuation property for parabolic operators,* Proc. of AMS, 132, (2), (2004), 499-501.

[9] Ali G., I. Torcicollo, S. Vessella, *Inverse doping problems for a P-N function,* J. Inverse Ill-Posed Probl. 14, (6), (2006), 537-546.

[10] B.K. Amonov, *The stability of solution of Cauchy problem for a second order equation of parabolic type with data on a time-like manifold,* Funkcional. Anal. i Priložen 6, (3), (1972), 1-9.

[11] B.K. Amonov, S.P. Shishatskii, *An a priori estimate of the solution of the Cauchy problem with data on a time-like surface for a second order parabolic equation, and related uniqueness theorems,* Dokl. Akad Nauk *SSSR* 206 (1972), n.1 11-12.

[12] S. Andrieux, A. Ben Abda, M. Jaoua, *Identifiabilité de frontière inaccessible par des mesures de surface*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, 316, (1993), 429-434.

[13] N. D. Aparicio, C. Atkinson, *An inverse boundary problem for the steady-diffusion equation with moving boundaries with appliations to the pearlite-austenite transformation in steel*, Inverse Problems 18, (2002), 1013-1023.

[14] N. Aronszajn, *Sur l'unicité du prolongement des solutions des équations aux dérivées partielles elliptiques du second ordre*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris 242, (1956), 723–725.

[15] N. Aronszajn, A. Krzywicki and J. Szarski, *A unique continuation theorem for exterior differential forms on riemannian manifolds*, Ark. for Matematik, 4, (34), (1962), 417-453.

[16] D. G. Aronson, *Non-negative solutions of linear parabolic equations*, Ann. Sc. Norm.Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci., XXII, (1968), 607-694.

[17] V. Bacchelli, S. Vessella, *Lipschitz stability for a stationary 2D inverse problem with unknown polygonal boundary*, Inverse problems 22, (2006), 1627-1658.

[18] E. Beretta, S. Vessella, *Stable determination of boundaries from Cauchy data*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 30, (1998), 220-32.

[19] A. Binder, *On an inverse problem arising in continuous casting of steel billets*, Appl. Anal. 57, (1995), 341-366.

[20] A. Binder, H. W. Engl, S. Vessella, *Some inverse problems for a nonlinear parabolc equation connected with continuous casting of steel: stability estimates and regularization*, Numer Funct. Anal. and Optimiz. 11 (7&8), (1990), 643-671.

[21] P. Bison, M. Ceseri, D. Fasino, G. Inglese, *Active infrared thermography in non-destructive evaluation of surface corrosion 2: heat exchange between specimen and enviroment*, WSPC simai 06, (2006).

[22] P. Bison, D. Fasino, G. Inglese, *Active infrared thermography in non-destructive evaluation*, Applied an Industrial Mathematics in Italy, M. Primicerio, R. Spigler, V.Valente (Editors) Proceedings of 7th Conference, Venice, Italy 2004.

[23] K. Bryan, *Structure characterization with thermal wave imaging.* Proceedings of Review of Progress in Quantitative Nondestructive Testing, UCSD, San Diego, CA, 1992. Plenum Publishers, 1993.

[24] K. Bryan, *A boundary integral method for an inverse problem in thermal imaging*, Journal of mathematical Systems, Estimation and Control, 17, (1), (1997), 1-27.

[25] K. Bryan, L. F. Caudill Jr., *An inverse problem in thermal imaging*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 56, 3, 1996, 715-735.

[26] K. Bryan, L. F. Caudill Jr., *Uniqueness for a boundary identification problem in thermal imaging*, Differential Equations and Computational Simulations III, J. graef, R. Shivaji, B. Soni & Zhu (editors). Electronic journal of Differential Equations, Conference 01, 1997, 23-39. ISSN: 1072-6691. URL:Http://ejde.math.swt.edu or http://ejede.math.unt.edu, ftp 147.26.103.110 or 129.120.3.113 (login: ftp).

[27] K. Bryan, L. F. Caudill Jr., *Stability and reconstruction for an inverse problem for the heat equation*, Inverse Problems 14, (1998), 1429-1453.

[28] K. Bryan, L. F. Caudill, *Reconstruction of an unknown boundary portion from Cauchy data in n dimensions*, Inverse Problems, 21, (2005), 239-255.

[29] A. L. Bukgheim, Introduction to the thery of inverse problems, *VSP, Utrecht, 2000.*

[30] A. L. Bukhgeim, J. Chen, M. Yamamoto, *Uniqueness and stability for an inverse problem of determining parts of boundary*, in Inverse Problems in Engineering Mechanics, M. Tannaka, G. S. Dulikravich (editors), Elsevier, Amsterdam, (1998), 327-336.

[31] A. L. Bukhgeim, J. Chen, M. Yamamoto, *Conditional stability in an inverse problem of determining a non-smooth boundary*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 242, (2000), 57-74.

[32] Burger M., H. W. Engl, P. Markowich, P. Pietra, *Identification of doping profiles in semiconductor devices,* Inverse Problems 17, (2001), 1765-1795.

[33] J.R. Cannon, *A priori estimate for continuation of the solution of the heat equation in the space variable*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4), 65, (1964), 377-387.

[34] J. R. Cannon, *A Cauchy problem for the heat equation*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4), 66, (1964), 155-165.

[35] J. R. Cannon, The one-dimensional heat equation, *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 83, Addison-Wesley. New York, 1984.*

[36] B. Canuto, E. Rosset, S. Vessella, *Quantitative estimates of unique continuation for parabolic equations and inverse initial-boundary value problems with unknown boundaries*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 354, (2), (2002), 491-535.

[37] B. Canuto, E. Rosset, S. Vessella, *A stability result in the localization of cavities in a thermic conducting medium*, ESAIM: Control Optimization and Calculus of Variations. 7, 2002, 521-565.

[38] T. Carleman, *Sur un problème d'unicité pour les systèmes d'équations aux dérivées partielles à deux variables*, Ark. Mat. Astr. Fys. 26B, (17, (1939), 1-9.

[39] C. Carthel, H. W. Engl, *Identification of heat transfer functions in continuous casting of steel by regularization*, J. Inv. Ill-Posed Problems, 8, (6), (2000), 677-693.

[40] J.Chen, Y. C. Hon, M. Yamamoto, *Conditional stability estimation for an inverse boundary problem with non-smooth boundary in* $\mathbb{R}^3$, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 353, (10), 4123-4138.

[41] X. Y. Chen, *A strong unique continuation theorem for parabolic equations*, Mathematishes Annalen, 311, (1996), 603-630.

[42] R. Chapko, R. Kress, J. R. Yoon, *On the numerical solution of an inverse boundary value problem for the heat equation*, Inverse Problems 14, (1998), 853-867.

[43] R. Chapko, R. Kress, J. R. Yoon, *An inverse boundary value problem for the heat equation: the Neumann condition*, Inverse Problems 15, (1999), 1033-1046.

[44] Colton D., *The noncharacteristic Cauchy problem for parabolic equations in one space variable,* SIAM J. Math. Anal. 5, (1974), 263-272.

[45] H. O. Cordes, *Über die eindeutige Bestimmtheit der Lösungen elliptischer Differentialgleichungen durch Anfangsvorgaben.* Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen. Math.-Phys. Kl. IIa., (1956), 239–258.

[46] R. Courant, D. Hilbert, Methods of Mathematical Physics*, Vol. 1, Wiley Interscience, New York, 1962.*

[47] K. E. Cramer, W. P. Winfree, *Thermal characterization of defects in aircraft structures via spatially controlled heat application*, NASA Center: Langley Research Center, 1997.

[48] D. J. Crowther, L. D. Favro, P. K. Kuo, R. L. Thomas, *Inverse scattering algorithm applied to infrared thermal wave images*, J. Appl. Phys. 74 (9), (1993), 5828-5834.

[49] Y. Daido, Reconstruction of inclusion for the inverse boundary value problem of heat equation using probe method, *Ph. Doct. Thesis, Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-0810, 2006.*

[50] Dè-yuan' Li, *An inequality for the parabolic operator*, Sci. Sinica 12, 1963, 1425-1467.

[51] M. Di Cristo, *Stability and instability for inverse boundary value problems with unknown boundaries,* PhD Thesis, Università degli Studi di Trieste, 2004.http://www1.mate.polimi.it/~dicristo

[52] M. Di Cristo, L. Rondi, *Examples of exponential instability for inverse inclusion and scattering problems*, Inverse Problems, 19, (2003), 685-701.

[53] M. Di Cristo, L. Rondi, S. Vessella, *Stability properties of an inverse parabolic problem with unknown boundaries*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) 185 (2) (2006) 223-255. .

[54] M. M. Eller, V. Isakov, *Carleman estimates with two large parameters and applications*, Contemporary Mathematics, 268, (2000), 117-136.

[55] H. W. Engl, T. Langthaler, P. Manselli, *On an inverse problem for a nonlinear heat equation connected with continuous casting of steel.* International Series of Numerical Mathematics 78. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1987.

[56] A. Erdélyi ed., Tables of integral transforms, *Vol. I, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1954.*

[57] L. Escauriaza and J. Fernandez, *Unique continuation for parabolic operator,* Ark. för Matematik 41, (1), (2003), 35-60.

[58] L. Escauriaza, G. Seregin, V. Šverák, *Backward uniqueness for the heat operator in a half-space*, St. Petersburg Math. J. , 15, (1), (2004), 139-148.

[59] L. Escauriaza, S. Vessella, *Optimal three cylinder inequalities for solutions to parabolic equations with Lipschitz leading coefficients*, in G. Alessandrini and G. Uhlmann eds, "Inverse Problems: Theory and Applications" Contemporary Mathematics 333, (2003), American Mathematical Society, Providence R. I. , 79-87.

[60] L. Escauriaza, F. J. Fernandez, S. Vessella, *Doubling properties of caloric functions*, Applicable Analysis, 85, (1-3), (2006), Special issue dedicated to the memory of Carlo Pucci, editors R. Magnanini and G. Talenti.

[61] L. C. Evans, Partial differential equations, *American Mathematical Society, Providence 1998.*

[62] D. Fasino, G. Inglese, *An inverse Robin problem for Laplace's equation: theoretical results and numerical methods.* Inverse Problems 15, (1999), 41-48.

[63] D. Fasino, G. Inglese, *Stability estimates for a boundary identification problem in a thin domain.* Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim. 22, (5-6), (2001), 549-560.

[64] F. J. Fernandez, *Unique continuation for parabolic operator II,* Comm. Part. Diff. Equat., 28, (9&10), (2003), 1597-1604.

[65] A. Friedman, Partial differential equation of parabolic type, *Prentice Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1964.*

[66] A. V. Fursikov and O. Yu. Imanuvilov, Controllability of parabolic equations, *Lecture Notes vol. 34 (Seoul Korea: Seoul National University), 1996.*

[67] N. Garofalo, F.H. Lin, *Monotonicity properties of variational integrals A_p-weights and unique continuation*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. , 35, (1986), 245-267.

[68] Gevrey M., Sur la nature analytique des solutions des équations aux dérivées partielles. Primier mémoire. Ann. Sci. École Norm Sup. 35, (3), (1918), 129-190.

[69] R. Ja. Glagoleva, *Some properties of solutions of a linear second order parabolic equation*, Math. USSR-Sbornik, 3 (1), (1967), 41-67.

[70] D. Gilbarg, N. Trudinger, Elliptic partial differential equations of Second Order, *(2nd ed.), Springer, Berlin, 1983.*

[71] W. Grever, *A nonlinear parabolic initial boundary value problem modelling the continuous casting of steel*, Z. angew Math. Mech 78, (2), (1998), 109-119.

[72] E. Grinzato, P. G. Bison, S. Marinetti, *Monitoring of ancient buildings by thermal method*, Journal of Cultural Heritage, 3, (2000), 21-29.

[73] J. Hadamard, Lectures on Cauchy's problem in linear partial differential equations, *Dover, New York, 1953.*

[74] D. N. Hào, *A noncharacteristic Cauchy problem for linear parabolic equations and related inverse problems. I. Solvability.* Inverse Problems 10, (2), (1994), 295-315.

[75] C. D. Hill, *Parabolic equations in one space variable and the non-characteristic Cauchy problem,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 20, (1967), 619-633.

[76] T. Hohage, M. L. Rapún and F. J. Sayas, Detecting corrosion using thermal measurements, Inverse Problems 23, (2007), 53-72.

[77] E. Holmgren, *Sur l'equation de la propagation de la chaleur*, Arkiv. Mat. Fys., 14, (1908), 1-11.

[78] L. Hörmander, Linear partial differential operators, *Springer, New York, 1963.*

[79] L. Hörmander, The analysis of linear partial differential operators, *Springer, New York, 1985.*

[80] L. Hörmander, *Uniqueness theorems for second order elliptic differential equations*, Comm. Part. Diff. Equat. 8, (1983), 21-64.

[81] F. John, *Continuous dependence on data for solutions of partial differential equations with a prescribed bound*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., XIII, (1960), 551-585.

[82] P. G. Kaup, F. Santosa, Nondestructive evaluation of corrosion damage using electrostatic easurements, J. Nondtructive Evaluation, 14, (1995), 127-136.

[83] P. G. Kaup, F. Santosa, M. Vogelius, A method for imaging corrosion damage in thin plates from electrostatic data, Inverse Problems,12, (1996), 279-293.

[84] H. Kawakami, Y. Moriyama, M. Tsuchiya, *An estimation problem for the shape of a domain varying with time via parabolic equations*, Inverse Problems 23, (2007), 755-783.

[85] C. E. Kenig, *Some recent quantitative unique continuation theorems*, Semin. Équ. Dériv. Partielles, École Polytech., Palaiseau, 2006

[86] C. E. Kenig, W. Wang, *A note on boundary unique continuation for harmonic function in non-smmooth domains*, Potential Anal, 8, (1998), 143-147.

[87] M. V. Klibanov, A. Timonov, Carleman estimates for coefficient inverse problems and numerical applications, *Inverse and Ill-Posed Problems Series, VSP, Utrecht 2004.*

[88] M. V. Klibanov, *Inverse problems and Carleman estimates*, Inverse Problems, 8, (1992), 575-596.

[89] H. Koch, D. Tataru, *Carleman estimates and unique continuation for second order parabolic equations with nonsmooth coefficients*, arXiv: 0704.1349v1 [math.AP] 11 Apr 2007.

[90] P. Knabner, S. Vessella, *Stabilization of ill-posed Cauchy problems for parabolic equations*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. 149, (1987), 393-409.

[91] I. Kukavica, *Quantitative uniqueness for second-order elliptic operators*, Duke Math. J. 91, (1998), 225-240.

[92] I. Kukavica, N. Kaj, *Unique continuation on the boundary for Dini domains*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 126 (1998), no. 2, 441–446.

[93] M. Ikehata, *Virtual signal in the heat equation and the enclosure method*, Symposium on Inverse Problems Honoring Alberto Calderon, 15 Jan to 19 Jan 2007, IMPA, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

[94] M. Ikehata, *Virtual signal in the heat equation and the enclosure method*, Inverse Problems in Applied Sciences-towards breakthrough-, Journal of Physics: Conference Series 73(2007)012010.

[95] G. Inglese, F. Santosa, *An inverse problem in corrosion detection*, Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Analisi Globale ed Applicazioni del CNR, Firenze, 1995, n. 75.

[96] G. Inglese, *An inverse problem in corrosion detection*, Inverse Problems, 13, (1997), 977-994.

[97] G. Inglese, F. Mariani, *Corrosion detection in conducting boundaries*, Inverse Problems, 20, (2004), 1207-1215.

[98] V. Isakov, *Carleman type estimate in an anisotropic Case and applications,* J. of Diff. Equat., 105, (2), (1993), 217-238.

[99] V. Isakov, Inverse problems for partial differential equations, *Springer, New York, 1998.*

[100] V. Isakov, *Some inverse problems for the diffusion equation*, Inverse Problems 15, (1999), 3-10.

[101] V. Isakov, *Carleman type estimates and their applications*, (2000), in "New Analytic and Geometric Methods in Inverse Problems", K. Bingham, Ya. V. Kurylev, E. Sommersalo (editors), Lectures given at the EMS Summer School and Conference, Edinburgh, 2000, Springer.

[102] V. Isakov, *On uniqueness of obstacles and boundary conditions from restricted dynamical and scattering data*, preprint, 2007.

[103] S. Ito, H. Yamabe, *A unique continuation theorem for solutions of a parabolic differential equation*, J. Math. Soc. Japan 10, (1958), 314-321.

[104] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya, V. A. Solonnikov and N. N. Ural'tseva, Linear and quasilinear equations of parabolic type, *Transl. Math. Monogr. 23, AMS, Providence, R. I., 1968.*

[105] E. M. Landis, *Some questions in the qualitative theory of elliptic and parabolic equations,* AMS Translation, 2, (20), (1962), 173-238.

[106] E. M. Landis, *A three sphere theorem*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 148 (1963), 277-279, Engl. trans. Soviet Math. Dokl. 4 (1963), 76-78.

[107] E. M. Landis, *Some problems of the qualitative theory of second order elliptic equations (case of several independent variables),* Uspehi Mat. Nauk, 18, (1), (1963), 3-62, Engl. trans. Russian Math. Surveys 18 (1963), 1-62

[108] E. M. Landis, O. A. Oleinik, *Generalized analyticity and some related properties of solutions of elliptic and parabolic equations*, Russian Math. Surveys 29, (1974), 195-212.

[109] M. M. Lavrentiev, V. G. Romanov and S. P. Shishatskij, Ill-posed problems of mathematical physics and analysis, *Transl. Math. Monogr. 64, AMS, Providence, R. I., 1986.*

[110] M. Lees and M. H. Protter, *Unique continuation for parabolic equations.* Duke Math. J. 28, (1961), 369-382.

[111] G. M. Lieberman, Second order parabolic differential equations, *World Scientific, London, 1996.*

[112] F. H. Lin, *A uniqueness theorem for parabolic equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. XLIII, (1990), 127-136.

[113] J. L. Lions, E. Magenes, Non-homogeneous boundary value problems and applications, I, II, *Springer, New York, 1972.*

[114] A. Lunardi, *An introduction to parabolic moving boundary problems*, Functional analytic methods for evolution equations, 371-399. Lecture Notes in Math. 1855, Springer, Berlin, 2004.

[115] X. Maldague, *Applications of infrared thermography in nondestructive evaluation*, Trends in Optical Nondestructive Testing (invited chapter), Pramod Rastogi ed., (2000), 591-609.

[116] N. Mandache, *Exponential instability in an inverse problem for the Schrödinger equation*, Inverse Problems 17, (2001), 1435-1444.

[117] P. Manselli, S. Vessella, *On continuous depedence on noncharacteristic Cauchy data, for level lines of solutions of the heat equation*, Forum Math. 3, (1991), 513-521.

[118] K. Miller, *Non-unique continuation for certain ode's in Hilbert space and for uniformly parabolic and elliptic equations in divergence form*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., 54, (1963), 105-117.

[119] A. Morassi, E. Rosset, *Stable determination of cavities in elastic bodies*, Inverse Problems, 20, (2004), 453-480.

[120] A. Morassi, E. Rosset, *Uniqueness and stability in determining a rigid inclusion in an elastic body*, to appear on Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.

[121] G. Nakamura, *Reconstruction scheme for identifying the medium discontinuity*, Graduate School of Sciences, 2006.

[122] L. Niremberg, *Uniqueness in Cauchy problems for differential operators with constant leading coefficients*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 10, (1957), 89-105.

[123] L. E. Payne, *Improved stability estimates for classes of illposed Cauchy problems*, Appl. Anal. 19, (1985), 63-74.

[124] A. Pliš, *On non-uniqueness in Cauchy problem for an elliptic second order differential equation*, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Math Astronom. Phys. 11, (1963), 95-100.

[125] C. C. Poon, *Unique continuation for parabolic equations*, Comm. in Part. Diff. Equat. 21, (1996), 521-539.

[126] M. H. Protter, *Properties of solutions of parabolic equations and inequalities*, Canad. J. Math. 13, (1961), 331-345.

[127] C. Pucci, *Alcune limitazioni per le soluzioni di equazioni paraboliche*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. IV, (48), (1959), 161-172.

[128] C. Pucci, *Nuove ricerche sul problema di Cauchy,* Mem. Accad. Sci. Torino. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Nat. 1, (3), (1953), 45-67.

[129] S. Rionero, I. Torcicollo, *On an ill-posed problem in non-linear heat conduction*, Transport Theory and Statistical Physics, 29, (1&2), (2000), 173-186.

[130] L. Rondi, *Optimal stability estimates for the determination of defects by electrostatic measurements, Inverse Problems 15, (1999), 1193-1212.*

[131] C. A. Santos, A. Garcia, C. R. Frick, J. A. Spim, *Evaluation of heat transfer coefficients along the secondary cooling zones in the continuous casting of steel billets*, Inverse Problems in Science and Engineering, 14, (6), (2006), 687-700.

[132] J. C. Saut and B. Scheurer, *Unique continuation for some evolution equations*, J. of Diff. Equat. 66, (1987), 118-139.

[133] S.P. Shishatskii, A. Asanov, E. R. Atamanov, Uniqueness Problems for Degenerating Equations and Nonclassical Problems, *Inverse and Ill-Posed Problems Series, VSP, Utrecht, 2001.*

[134] E. Sincich, *Lipschitz stability for the inverse Robin problem,* Inverse Problems, 23, (2007), 1311-1326.

[135] C. D. Sogge, *A unique continuation theorem for second order parabolic differential operators*, Ark. Mat. 28, (1), (1990), 159-182.

[136] F. Trèves, Linear partial differential equations*, Gordon and Breach Science Publisherer, New York 1970.*

[137] A. A. Varin, *Three-cylinder theorem for certain class of semilinear parabolic equations*, Mat. Zametki, 51, (1), (1992), 32-41.

[138] V. Vavilov, E. Grinzato, P. G. Bison, S. Marinetti, *Surface transient temperature inversion for hidden corrosion characterisation: theory and applications*, Int. J. Heat Transfer, 39, (1996), 355-371.

[139] S. Vessella, *A domain identification problem for the heat equation. Hölder stability estimate,* J. Ill-posed Problems, 3, (6), (1995), 495-503.

[140] S. Vessella, *Stability estimates in an inverse problem for a three-dimensional heat equation*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 28, (1997), 1354-1370.

[141] S. Vessella, *Three cylinder inequalities and unique continuation properties for parabolic equations*, Rend. Mat. Ac. Lincei, 9, 13, (2), (2002), 107-120.

[142] S. Vessella, *Carleman estimates, optimal three cylinder inequality and unique continuation properties for solutions to parabolic equations*, Comm. Part. Diff. Equat.28 (3&4), (2003), 637-627.

[143] N. G. Zamani, J. F. Porter, A. A. Mufti, *A survey of computational efforts in the field of corrosion engineering*, International Journal for Numerical in Engineering, 23, (1986), 1295-1311.

[144] C. Zuily, Uniqueness and non-uniqueness in the Cauchy problem, *Birkhäuser, Boston 1983.*

Sergio Vessella,
DiMaD, Università di Firenze,
via Lombroso 6/17
50134 Firenze (Italy).
E-mail: sergio.vessella@dmd.unifi.it